

Uṣūl Madh-hab al-Shī'ah

al-Imāmiyyah al-Ithnā 'Ashariyyah

A Comprehensive Study of the Shī'ah creed

by:

Doctor Nāṣir ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Qaffāri

WWW.MAHAJJAH.COM

Transliteration key

أ - 'ā	د - ḍ
آ - ā	ط - ṭ
ب - b	ظ - ṣ
ت - t	ع - 'a
ث - th	غ - gh
ج - j	ف - f
ح - ḥ	ق - q
خ - kh	ك - k
د - d	ل - l
ذ - dh	م - m
ر - r	ن - n
ز - z	و - w, ū
س - s	ه - h
ش - sh	ي - y, ī
ص - ṣ	

Contents

Foreword	13
The Sources of My Book	27
Outline of the Discussion	37
Definition of the Word ‘Shī’ah’	41
The Word ‘Shī’ah’ in the Qur’ān and its Meaning	45
The Word Shī’ah in the Sunnah and the Meanings Implied	50
The Word Shī’ah and its Meaning in the Books of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah	52
The Word Shī’ah in the Light of Islamic History	53
The Technical Meaning of the Word Shī’ah	55
a. As Defined by the Books of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah	55
The First Definition	55
An Analysis of the First Definition	56
The Second Definition	57
An Analysis of the Second Definition	58
The Third Definition of the Word Shī’ah	60
Other Definitions of the Word Shī’ah	63
b. The Definition of the Word Shī’ah from the Books of the Ismā‘īlī	65
c. The Definition of the Word Shī’ah from Other Sources	67
The Definition of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī	67
An Analysis of the Definition	67
The Definition of Ibn Ḥazm	68
The Definition of al-Shahrastānī	69
d. The Most Appropriate Definition	70
The Inception of the Shī’ah and its Historical Roots	75
Views of the Shī’ah Regarding Their Inception	75
The First View	75
An Analysis of this View	79
The Second View (of the Shī’ah)	85
An Analysis of this View	86
The Third View	90
The Views of Non-Shī’ah Regarding the Inception of Shī’ism	91
The First View	91

An Analysis of this View	92
The Second View	94
The Third View	101
The Fourth View	102
The Preferred View	102
The Origins of Shī'ism	105
The View that it has Jewish Roots	106
The View that Shī'ism is of Persian Origin	107
The View that Shī'ism is the Home of Old Asian Beliefs	112
The Preferred View Regarding the Origin of Shī'ism	113
The Sects of the Shī'ah	114
The Titles of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah Shī'ah's	125
Al-Shī'ah:	125
Al-Imāmiyyah	126
Al-Ithnā al-'Ashariyyah	130
Al-Qaṭ'iyyah	133
Aṣḥāb al-Intizār	134
Al-Rāfiḍah	134
Al-Ja'fariyyah	136
Al-Khāṣṣah (the special ones)	137
The Sects of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah	138
Section One - Their Beliefs Regarding the Sources of Islam	151
Chapter One - Their Beliefs Regarding the Glorious Qur'ān	151
Discussion One - Their Belief Regarding the Qur'ān as a Source of Proof	153
a. The Qur'ān Cannot be a Proof Unless it is accompanied With the Opinion of the Imām	153
b. Their Belief that the Knowledge of the Qur'ān and its Understanding is Confined to the Imāms	161
Analysis and Criticism of this View	166
Analysis of the Texts	166
The First Text: Wherein it is Claimed that Rasūlullāh ﷺ Explained the Qur'ān Only to 'Alī ﷺ	166
The Second Text: Whoever Seeks the Knowledge of the Qur'ān from Anyone Besides 'Alī ﷺ will be Destroyed	167

The Third Text	169
The Fourth Text	169
An Analysis of this View	170
c. Their Belief that the Imām has the Right to Abrogate Verses, Restrict the General Commands of the Qur’ān and Add Conditions to those which were Revealed Without any Conditions Attached to them, etc.	177
An Analysis of this Belief	181
Discussion Two - Their Beliefs Regarding the Interpretation of the Qur’ān	185
a) The Qur’ān Has Inner Meanings which Contradict the Apparent Meaning	185
An Analysis of This View	190
b) Their Belief that Most of the Qur’ān was Revealed Regarding them and Their Enemies	194
The Origin of These Interpretations, Their Roots and a Few Examples	208
Their Origin	208
A Few Examples of Shīʿī Interpretations of the Verses of the Qur’ān	213
Discussion Three - Do the Shīʿah Believe that the Qur’ān was Interpolated?	265
A Preamble to the Subject:	265
The Birth of this Doctrine – as Stated in the Books of the Ahl al-Sunnah	270
The Spread of this Belief Amongst Them – as Explained in the Books of the Ahl al-Sunnah	275
What Do the Shīʿī Sources Have to Say on this Subject?	288
The Inception of this Lie — Taken Directly from the Books of the Shīʿah	292
The Spread of this Lie in the Book of the Shīʿah	299
The Contents of the Narrations on Alterations in the Book of the Shīʿah	310
Do the Shīʿah Circulate Among Themselves Secret Copies?	342
The “Copy of ‘Alī”	351
The Amount of Narrations Pertaining to this Fabrication in the Books of the Shīʿah, and the Weight that it Holds According to Them	361
Do All Shīʿah Believe in the Authenticity of these Narrations and Regard them to be Mutawātir?	370
Do those who Reject this Kufr (from the Shīʿah) do so on Account of Taqiyyah?	375
Ibn Bābawayh and His Rejection of that which is Attributed to His Sect	382

Al-Ṭūsī and His Rejection of Taḥrīf	390
Al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā and His Rejection Taḥrīf	395
Al-Ṭabarsī and his Rejection of Taḥrīf	399
The Crux of the Discussion	405
Chapter Two - Their Beliefs Regarding the Sunnah (Aḥādīth)	411
The Speech of the Imām is Like the Speech of Allah and His Rasūl	412
The First Principle; The Knowledge of the Imāms is Attained Through Inspiration and Revelation	416
The Second Principle; The Treasures of Knowledge and the Trusts of knowledge are by the Imāms	423
Analyses of this belief	439
The Narratives of al-Riqāʿ	449
The Narrations of the Ṣaḥābah	464
The Beginning of the Compilation of Aḥādīth by the Shīʿah	477
The Primary Books of the Twelvers	478
A Few Observations Regarding the Eight Books	481
The Authenticity of the Narrations of these Compilations	494
The Narrators who Appear in their Isnāds	501
Jābir al-Juʿfī	506
Zurārah ibn Aʿyan	511
Types of Narrations – According to the Shīʿah	518
The Status of the Imāms Regarding whom the Shīʿah Make their Claims	531
Chapter Three - Their Beliefs Regarding Ijmāʿ (consensus of the Ummah)	541
1. Proof Lies in the Statement of the Imām, not in Ijmāʿ	541
2. Guidance Lies in Opposing the Masses (Ahl al-Sunnah)	553
Analysing this View	559
Section Two	569
Chapter One - Their Belief Regarding the Oneness of Allah as the Ilāh.	569
Discussion One - Interpreting the Verses of Tawḥīd to be a Reference to the Imāms	573
a. First verse	573
b. Second verse	577
c. Third verse	579

d. Fourth verse	580
Discussion Two - Wilāyah is the Basis for the Acceptance of Deeds	587
Discussion Three - Their Belief that the Imāms are the Intermediaries between Allah and the creation	595
a. Their belief that the guidance of mankind lies in the hands of the Imāms	599
b. Their belief that supplications are not accepted except if they contain the names of the Imāms	601
c. Istighāthah from the Imāms	608
d. Their belief that Ḥajj to the tombs is greater than Ḥajj to the House of Allah	614
Visiting Karbalā' on the Day of 'Arafāh is greater than visiting it on any other day	625
Visiting the grave of Ḥusayn is the best action	629
Karbalā' is greater than the Ka'bah	629
The angels appear before the visitors of Ḥusayn and Allah has private conversations with them	634
The rites of the graves	635
i. Performing Ṭawāf around graves	636
ii. Ṣalāh at the grave	638
iii. Prostrating at the graves	640
iv. Taking the grave as a Qiblah like the House of Allah	645
Analysing the practice of visiting the graves	650
Discussion Four - Their Belief That the Imām can Prohibit and Make Lawful What he Desires	659
Discussion Five - Their Belief That the Sand of Ḥusayn's Grave is a Cure for Every Sickness.	667
Discussion Six - Their Supplication by way of Charms and Esoteric Symbols and Their Seeking of Help From Unknown Entities	675
Discussion Seven - Istikhārah in ways That Resemble the Divination of the Days of Ignorance	681
Chapter Two - Their Beliefs Regarding the Oneness of Allah in Terms of Him Being the Rabb	691
Discussion One - Their belief that Rabb is their Imām	695

Discussion Two - Their Belief That This World and the Afterlife Both Belong to the Imām.	699
Discussion Three - Attributing Cosmic Occurrences to the Imāms	703
Discussion Four - A Divine Portion has Translocated into the Imāms	709
Discussion Five - Their Belief That Days and Nights Secure Benefit and Cause Harm	713
Chapter Three - Their Belief Regarding Allah's ﺳﻴِّدَﻫُﻤﺎ ﻭَﻋَﻠَﻰ Names and Attributes	719
Discussion One - Tajsīm (Anthropomorphism)	719
Discussion Two - Their Denial of the Attributes of Allah	729
1. Their stance with regards to the Qur'ān being created	737
2. Seeing Allah in the afterlife	749
3. The descent of Allah	751
Discussion Three - Describing their Imāms with the Names and Attributes of Allah	757
Discussion Four - Interpolation in Order to Support Their Stance of Denial	773
Chapter Four - Their Belief Regarding Īmān and its Fundamentals	775
Discussion One - Their view regarding Īmān, the promises, and warnings of Allah	775
1. Their definition of Īmān:	775
2. The third testimony of faith	778
3. The view of Irjā'	780
4. Their view with regards to the promises of Allah	784
5. Their view regarding the warnings of Allah	787
Discussion Two - Their belief regarding the fundamentals of Īmān	791
Īmān in the angels	792
Īmān in the divine books	797
1. Their belief that divine books descended upon the Imāms	797
a. The Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah:	800
b. A book that was revealed to the Rasūl of Allah ﺻﻠﻰ ﺍﻟﻠﻪ ﻋﻠﻴﻪ ﻭﺍﻟﻪ ﻭﺍﻟﻪ ﺳﻠﻢ before his demise:	811
c. The Tablet of Fāṭimah:	815
d. Their claim that twelve scripts descended from the heavens which comprised of the attributes and the features of the Imāms:	817

Analysing this doctrine	819
2. Their claim that the Imāms are in possession of all the divine books	823
Analysing this doctrine	829
Belief in the Prophets	834
Holding the Imāms in Higher Esteem than the Ambiyā'	835
The miracles of the Imāms	845
Belief in the Last Day	856
Their Belief in Pre-destiny	870
Section Three	885
Chapter One - Imāmah	885
The concept of Imāmah according to the Shī'ah and its inception:	886
The position of Imāmah according to them	889
The secrecy of this doctrine	892
Confining the Imāms to a specific number	896
Analysing the belief of confining the Imāms to a specific number	910
Their Evidence Regarding Imāmah:	918
Their Evidences from the Qur'ān:	922
Their evidence from the Sunnah	930
Their Strongest Evidence from the Sunnah	936
Naṣṣ in the Books of the Shī'ah:	946
Deriving Evidence from the Widely Known and the Unanimously Established Aspects of Dīn	955
The Ruling regarding a Person who denies the Imāmah of One of the Twelve Imāms	967
The Ṣaḥābah	970
The Alleged Shortcomings of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ:	994
The Ahl al-Bayt	996
The Muslim Rulers and their Governments	1000
The Muslim Metropolises	1002
The Muslim Judges	1006
The Imāms of the Muslims and their Scholars	1008
The Islamic Denominations	1010
The Entire Ummah	1015
The group which the Shī'ah Exclude from their Blanket Excommunication and Curses	1018

Analyses	1019
The Qur'ān	1022
The Pristine Sunnah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ	1028
The Commendation of the Ṣaḥābah by the Imāms	1030
Evidence sourced from reason, history, the categorically established aspects of dīn and the consensus of the Ummah:	1036
Chapter Two - 'Iṣmah of the Imāms	1045
The Inception of the Doctrine of 'Iṣmah and its development	1047
The Different Phases of the Doctrine of 'Iṣmah	1048
Their evidence regarding the Infallibility of the Imāms	1055
Their evidence from the Qur'ān:	1055
Critiquing their evidence:	1057
Their evidence from the Sunnah	1061
Their Logical Substantiations for the Doctrine of Infallibility:	1064
A general analysis of the doctrine of the infallibility of the Imāms	1068
Chapter Three - Taqiyyah (dissimulation)	1083
The Definition of Taqiyyah	1083
Their Evidence for Taqiyyah:	1106
Chapter Four - The Doctrine of the Mahdī and Occultation	1109
The Doctrine of the Mahdī and the Occultation According to the Various Sects of the Shī'ah	1110
The Inception of the Doctrine of Occultation according to the Twelvers and its Development	1114
The Condition of the Shī'ah after the demise of Ḥasan al-'Askarī	1114
Impetuses for believing in occultation	1117
The Founder of the Doctrine of Occultation According to the Twelvers:	1121
A Broad Overview of the Story of the Mahdī According to the Twelvers	1130
Evidence for the Occurrence of the Ghaybah	1163
How the Shī'ah Justify the Prolonged Period of the Occultation:	1167
The Mahdī after his Alleged Return:	1174
The Sharī'ah of their Mahdī:	1174
The Life and Deeds of the Awaited Mahdī:	1179
The Army of the Mahdī	1193
The Shī'ah and the Occultation of their Mahdī:	1195
The Representation of the Hidden Mahdī	1202

Analysing the Doctrine of Occultation and the Mahdī According to the Twelvers	1210
Chapter Five - Raj'ah (The Return)	1221
Their Evidence for the Doctrine of Raj'ah	1229
Analysing the Doctrine of Raj'ah:	1240
Chapter Six - The Doctrine of Ḥuhūr (Emergence)	1244
Analysis of this Doctrine	1248
Chapter Seven - The Doctrine of Badā'	1251
Their Evidence for the Doctrine of Badā'	1267
Narrations in the Books of the Twelvers which Refute the Doctrine of Badā'	1270
Chapter Eight - The Doctrine of Ṭīnah	1273
Analysing the Doctrine of Ṭīnah	1281
Section Four The Contemporary Shī'ah and Their Link with Their Predecessors	1285
Introduction	1285
Chapter one - Relationship in the sources of Talaqqī (acquisition)	1287
Chapter Two - Their Link with the Ancient Sects	1293
Chapter Three - The Doctrinal Connection between the Early Scholars and the Contemporaries	1301
Discussion 1: The Belief of the Contemporaries Regarding the Book of Allah	1305
The First Perspective	1305
The First Reaction: Outright denial of its existence in their books	1306
Analyses	1307
The Second Reaction: Acknowledging its Existence and Attempting to Give a Plausible Explanation	1311
Analyses	1313
The Third Reaction: Defiantly Proclaiming and Providing Evidence for it	1320
The First Misconception	1334
The second misconception	1338
The third misconception	1340
The fourth misconception	1345
The fifth misconception:	1347
The sixth misconception	1350

The seventh misconception	1352
The eighth misconception	1360
The ninth misconception	1363
The tenth misconception	1364
The eleventh misconception	1367
The Twelfth Misconception	1371
The Forth Reaction: Overtly denying this Blasphemy whilst trying to prove it in Deceitful and Discreet Ways at the Same Time.	1388
The Second Angle to the discussion: The Viewpoint of the Contemporaries regarding Interpreting the Book of Allah	1396
Discussion 2: The Sunnah according to the Contemporaries	1409
Discussion 3: Consensus of the Ummah according to the contemporaries	1413
Discussion 4: Their Belief regarding the Fundamentals of Dīn	1415
Discussion 5: Imāmāh	1431
The First Issue: the stance of the contemporaries regarding the excommunication of the Muslims which is found in their seminal works	1431
The second Issue: their stance regarding Muslim governments	1440
The Third Issue: the stance of the contemporaries regarding the Ṣaḥābah	1449
Analyses:	1458
The Reality of the Praise of the Shī'ah for the Ṣaḥābah	1472
Discussion 6: 'Iṣmah (Infallibility)	1475
Discussion 7: Raj'ah (the return)	1479
Discussion 8: Taqīyyah	1487
The Scholars of the Shī'ah practice Taqīyyah even with their Followers:	1505
Chapter Four - The State of the Scholars	1509
The Ideology of its Founder	1511
Firstly: Polytheistic leanings	1512
His Belief in the Impact of Stars and Days upon the Movements of Men	1515
The Reality of Shirk according to Khomeini	1516
Secondly Extremism in Taṣawwuf	1516
1. Special incarnation	1517
2. Complete Incarnation	1519
Thirdly: Claiming Prophethood	1521

Fourthly: Extremism in Shīʿī Belief	1526
Fifthly: His view regarding the Comprehensive Authority of the Jurist	1539
The Opposition of some of the Shīʿī scholars of the idea of Khomeini regarding the Representational Authority of the Jurist	1553
The Constitution of the State of the Scholars	1556
Chapter Five - Their influence on the Muslim world	1563
The Doctrinal and Ideological Sphere	1565
Bringing about Shirk in the Ummah of Muḥammad ﷺ	1565
Obstructing From the Dīn of Allah	1566
The Emergence of Heterodoxy and Heresy	1569
Trying to Misguide the Muslims from the Sunnah of their Nabī	1570
Overtly Entering the Dogma of the Ahl al-Sunnah in order to Misguide	1572
Spreading Shīʿism in the Muslim World	1576
The Emergence of Shīʿī Leanings in the Writings of some Writers who are Affiliates of the Ahl al-Sunnah	1582
Distorting the History of the Muslims	1586
In Literature	1588
The Political Sphere	1591
The Conspiracy of Ibn al-ʿAlqamī the Shīʿī	1598
The Safawid Dynasty	1603
The Social Sphere	1607
Firstly: Their rapport with the Muslims	1607
Secondly: Internal conflicts	1617
Thirdly, Libertinism	1618
The Economical Sphere	1623
Listen to this Serious Statement	1623
The Ruling regarding them	1636
The First Discussion	1636
The Ruling regarding them being Innovators and not Disbelievers	1636
The Second Discussion	1638
The Ruling regarding their Kufr	1638
Imām Mālik	1638
Imām Aḥmad	1640
Al-Bukhārī (d. 256 A.H)	1642
ʿAbd Allah ibn Idrīs	1643
ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī	1643

Al-Firyābī	1644
Aḥmad ibn Yūnus	1644
Abū Zur‘ah al-Rāzī	1645
Ibn Qutaybah	1645
‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī	1646
Qāḍī Abū Ya‘lā	1647
Ibn Ḥazm	1647
Al-Isfarā‘īnī	1649
Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī	1650
Qāḍī ‘Ayāḍ	1651
Al-Sam‘ānī	1653
Al-Rāzī	1654
Ibn Taymiyyah	1654
Ibn Kathīr	1659
Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad al-Maqdisī	1660
Abū al-Maḥāsīn Yūsuf al-Wāsiṭī	1660
‘Alī ibn Sulṭān al-Qārī	1662
Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb	1662
Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Dehlawī	1666
Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Shawkānī	1666
The scholars of the Ottoman Empire	1668
The Scholars of Mā Warā’ al-Nahr	1668

The Epilogue

1673

Foreword

In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful

All praise is due to Allah. We praise Him, seek His help, forgiveness and protection from the evil of our souls and bad actions. Whoever Allah guides is truly guided, and whoever He misguides, will not find anyone to guide him. I bear witness that there is no deity besides Allah, alone. He has no partners. I testify that Muḥammad is His servant and Messenger.

Indeed it is among the great principles of Islam to collectively hold onto the rope of Allah and to abstain from disunity. Allah Ta'ālā says:

وَاعْتَصِمُوا بِحَبْلِ اللَّهِ جَمِيعًا وَلَا تَفَرَّقُوا

And hold firmly to the Rope of Allah all together and do not become divided.¹

Allah says again:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ فَرَّقُوا دِينَهُمْ وَكَانُوا شِبَعًا لَسْتَ مِنْهُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ

Indeed, those who have divided their religion and become sects — you, [O Muḥammad], are not [associated] with them in anything.²

The Muslims followed the path of guidance and true religion, corresponding to the authentic narrations and the obvious demands of logic, which was the path upon which Allah sent His Messenger. This continued until the assassination of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه, whereupon the great strife occurred and the Muslims fought against one another at Šifḥīn. This is where the foreseen deviation took place.

1 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 103

2 Sūrah al-An'ām: 159

Nabī ﷺ described it in the following words:

تمرق مارقة على حين فرقة من المسلمين يقتلهم اولى الطائفتين بالحق

The Māriqah¹ will deviate at a time when the Muslims will be divided. The group closest to the truth will fight them.²

Their deviation occurred when the two arbitrators concluded their matters and people separated without agreeing. Thereafter, the innovation of the Khawārij was followed by the innovations of Shī'ism³, and then different sects continued to emerge, just as Nabī ﷺ informed us.⁴ Shī'ism first appeared in Kūfah.

1 This is one of the names of the Khawārij. They are the ones who revolted against 'Alī رضي الله عنه after he agreed to arbitration. Thus, he fought them on the Day of Nahrawān. Nabī ﷺ commanded that they should be killed in many authentic aḥādīth. *Al-Bukhārī* and *Muslim* contain tens of aḥādīth regarding them. *Al-Bukhārī* reports three, whilst *Muslim* reports the rest. (*Sharḥ al-Taḥāwīyyah* pg. 530) Ibn al-Qayyim quotes all of them together in *Tahdhīb al-Sunan* (7/148-153). Read more about their beliefs and sect in *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* (pg. 72) and *Al-Milal wa l-Niḥal* (1/146) and *Al-Fiṣal* (5/51-56).

2 Refer to *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (with the commentary of al-Nawawī) Kitāb al-Zakāh, Bāb Dhikr al-Khawārij wa Ṣifātihiḥ 7/68.

3 Refer to *Minḥāj al-Sunnah* of Ibn Taymiyyah 1/218-219.

4 The ḥadīth about the ummah splitting into seventy-three sects is as stated by Ibn Taymiyyah, “a *mash-hūr* (one level below *mutawātir*) and authentic ḥadīth, which appears in the *Sunan* and *Masānīd* (different types of ḥadīth books).” (*al-Fatāwā* 3/345, gathered by 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Qāsim). “There are so many narrations of the ḥadīth regarding the splitting of the ummah into seventy-three sects that no doubt can remain regarding the meaning thereof.” (*al-'Ilm al-Shāmikh* pg. 414).

It should be noted that this ḥadīth has been narrated without mentioning that any of them will be doomed. This version has been reported by most of the ḥadīth scholars including the authors of the *Sunan* (besides al-Nasā'ī). Other versions mention that one will attain salvation and the rest will be doomed. This is not reported by any of the authors of the *Sunan* besides *Abū Dāwūd* in *Kitāb al-Sunnah* (4573). It is also reported in *Al-Dāramī* (2/241), *Aḥmad* (4/102), *Ḥākim* (1/128) and al-Ājurri reports it in *al-Sharīḥ* (pg. 18).

Just as the Ahl al-Sunnah have reported this ḥadīth, the Shī'ah have also done so. The wording reported by them is, “my ummah will split into seventy two groups, from which seventy one groups will be doomed and one will attain salvation. They asked, ‘who will that group be o Rasūllāh?’ He replied, ‘the majority, the majority, the majority!’” Another narration states, “My ummah will split up into seventy three sects after me. One sect from them will attain salvation and seventy two will be in hell.” Refer to *al-Khiṣāl* of Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (2/584-585). *continued...*

Shī'ī narrations have stated that none of the cities of the Muslims accepted their ideology except Kūfah,¹ thereafter, it spread to the other cities. *Irjā'*², *Qadr*³ and *I'tizāl*⁴ also first appeared in Kūfah. Incorrect sacrifices started off in Baṣrah, but their strength was realised in Khurāsān.

All of these innovations took place in areas that were far from the 'City of Nubuwwah'.⁵ This is because innovations do not flourish and spread except when ignorance prevails, and the people of knowledge and īmān are scarce. It is for this reason that one of the predecessors said:

It is from the good-fortune of a new Muslim and a non-Arab that Allah guides him to a scholar from the Ahl al-Sunnah.⁶

These people would be affected very quickly by mischief and deviation on account of their poor ability of recognising misguidance and finding its flaws.

Thus, the best method to fight deviation and undo sectarianism is to spread the Sunnah between the masses, and explain to them the deviation of those who do not abide to it. This is why the Imāms of the Ahl al-Sunnah exerted themselves in

continued from page 16

There is also a narration which states that all the sects will attain salvation besides one, i.e. the irreligious sect. The 'ulamā have classified this narration as a fabrication. Refer to *Kashf al-Khafā* (1/369), *Al-Asrār al-Marfū'ah* (pg. 161).

There is no clear mention in these narrations that all these sects will be from the Shī'ah. Added to that, it is unambiguously stated that the sect that will attain salvation is the majority (not the Shī'ah)!

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 100/259.

2 The belief that sins make no difference as long as a person has īmān.

3 Rejection of the concept of pre-destination.

4 In principle, to give preference to ones logic over the texts of Islam.

5 Ibn Taymiyyah: *Majmū' Fatāwā* 20/301.

6 Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī: *Sharḥ Uṣūl I'tiqād Ahl al-Sunnah li Lālikā'ī* 1/60. This statement applies to the early days of Islam. In this belated era, Arabs and non-Arabs are equally in need of scholars from the Ahl al-Sunnah, as innovations have become widespread among all nations.

this matter, explained the condition of the deviates and refuted their assumptions. Imām Aḥmad refuted the views of the irreligious ones and the Jahmiyyah. Imām *Al-Bukhārī* did the same to the Jahmiyyah.¹ Imām Ibn Qutaybah refuted the views of the Jahmiyyah and the Mushabbihah² and al-Dārimī rejected the views of Bishr al-Murīsī and others.

It is indisputable that explaining the condition of those sects which have left the fold of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and have strayed away from the aḥādīth; is absolutely important. This removes confusion from the people and it clarifies the truth. It is a means of spreading the dīn of Allah and it serves as a proof against the deviant sects. Thus, destruction and salvation will take place after the establishment of proof. The truth will not seem obscure to anyone. The deviants misguide their followers purely on the basis of doubts and flimsy statements. This is why their followers are either irreligious or ignorant. Therefore, it is necessary to educate the ignorant and to expose the irreligious so that they are known and avoided.

Exposing the leaders of the innovators — who oppose the Qur’ān and Sunnah — is incumbent, according to the consensus of the Muslims. This is to the extent that when Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal was asked, “what is more pleasing to you: for a man to engage in optional ṣalāh, fasting and i’tikāf, or for him to expose the innovators?”, he replied, “if he engages in optional ṣalāh, fasts and does i’tikāf, then the benefit thereof will be confined to him. However, if he exposes the innovators, all the Muslims will benefit. Thus, it is better for him to expose the innovators.”

He explained that the benefit of this reaches the general Muslims, the same as fighting in the path of Allah. Cleansing the path of Allah, His dīn, His sharīah and repelling the rebellion and hatred of these people is indispensable. This is established from the unanimity of the Muslims regarding it. If Allah did not elect people to repel the evils of these people, then the dīn would have been totally corrupted. The harms of this would be worse than the harm of those enemies

1 The followers of Jahm ibn Safwān who held many deviant beliefs.

2 Anthropomorphists.

who conquer our lands. This is because when they conquer, their primary aim is not to corrupt the hearts and the dīn therein. As for these people, their primary effort is the corruption of the hearts.¹

The enemies who have been waiting for the opportunity to attack Islam have found in these sects — which have opposed the majority — a great niche which they may utilise to stir up conflict among the Muslims. It is not far-fetched that today the enemy is trying to maximise from this problem in their effort to counter the signs of the Islamic awakening which is expanding in all areas of society, and to stall the progress thereof, as it is on the verge of destroying their roots. They have adopted from the reports of their advisors (who pay special attention to the history and beliefs of these sects) — a methodology which they wish to implement in their relations with Muslims and their countries. This reveals to us the reason why they nurture some of these groups and pave the path for them to acquire positions of leadership and authority.

There is no doubt that explaining the reality of these groups will narrow the chances of the enemy as far as maintaining and widening the areas of differences is concerned. This is because turning a blind eye to the leaders of these irreligious innovators and allowing them to continue their efforts in misguiding people, gaining more followers, deceiving the masses and claiming that their buffoonery is part of Islam; will only turn people away from the dīn of Allah and His sharī'ah. One of the reasons behind the increase of atheists is that many of them mistook the actions of these people to be Islam, and when they realised its stark contradiction to basic logic; they became completely antagonistic towards religion itself.

In this era, most of the groups who oppose the majority have become weak, lost their ambition and supporters and even withdrew. Thus, they pose no real threat to the Ahl al-Sunnah. The Shī'ah, however, are increasing daily in their attacks upon the Ahl al-Sunnah in the form of physical injury, criticism of their dīn and a concerted effort to spread their ideologies among them.

1 Ibn Taymiyyah: *Majmū'at al-Rasā'il wa l-Masā'il* 5/110.

It is perhaps the sect of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah Shī‘ah (Twelvers) who are making the most effort to misguide the masses, if they are not the only sect doing so. Their perpetual insolence and plots against the Ahl al-Sunnah is unmatched by any other sect. My experience with the problem of Shī‘ism started when I was tasked with compiling a thesis for my masters on the subject, “the idea of bridging the gap between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī‘ah”. After completing my studies on the subject of ‘bridging the gap’, I wished to acquire a doctorate in the field of researching some of the classical books. Thus I submitted an application to research the first volume of the book, *al-Jawāb al-Ṣaḥīḥ li man Baddala Dīn al-Masīḥ* (The correct answer to those who have changed the religion of the Messiah) of Ibn Taymiyyah. However, professors from that faculty as well as others advised me to continue my studies regarding Shī‘ism, as there was a greater need to do an academic study of it as an independent subject.

After further consultation and seeking guidance from Allah ﷻ, I resolved to do an in-depth study of the fundamental doctrines of the Shī‘ah. I made this decision despite knowing very well that the effort required for this subject surpasses the required effort of the former subject to a great extent. This is because I am now burdened with the study of an entire religion, not just the book of one person. I have singled out and selected the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah instead of all the other sects of the Shī‘ah due to the following reasons:

1. They are the sect with the largest resources as far as books, institutions and legacy is concerned. This is to the extent that they name their beliefs, “the religion of the Imāmiyyah” and not just a “the *madh-hab* (codification of law) of the Imāmiyyah”. This is also because their religion is completely different to the religion of the rest of the ummah. It is sufficient for you to know that one of their ḥadīth sources from the Imāms comprises of one hundred and ten volumes, i.e. *Biḥār al-Anwār* of al-Majlisī (d. 1111 A.H)

1 *Al-I‘tiqād* by Ibn Bābawayh is referred to as *Dīn al-Imāmiyyah*. Refer to *al-Fahrist* of al-Ṭūsī pg. 189, Āghā Buzrug: *Al-Dharī‘ah* 2/226.

2. This sect leaves no stone unturned in its effort to spread its religion. They have propagators (who have no other duty in life besides this propagation) set up in almost every place. Their main aim is to propagate their beliefs among the Ahl al-Sunnah. I do not think that any other sect is equally passionate and serious about spreading their ideas. Today, they are exerting their energies in order to spread their religion in the Islamic world and strengthening their revolution. They are adopting many different avenues by which they wish to establish their leading country.

Due to the efforts of the Shī'ī pundits, many Muslim youth have left their religion and embraced Shī'ism. Whoever reads the book *The Epitome of Glory Regarding the History of Baṣrah and Najd* will be shocked, as he will learn that entire tribes were converted to Shī'ism. The embassies in the Shī'ī country of Iran have been turned into centres of propagation of their religion, especially among students and those making an effort for Islam in the Muslim world. They are more concerned about converting Muslims instead of non-Muslims.¹

There is no doubt that the responsibility of clarifying the reality for the Muslims is a great one, especially for those who have fallen prey to Shī'ism on account of their love for the Ahl al-Bayt and thought that this was the right path, the path of truth.

3. It is the largest Shī'ī sect in the world in this era. Most of the Shī'ī sects which were found throughout history have been incorporated into this sect. It presents, in its sources, a summary of the ideologies and views of the different Shī'ī groups which sprang up along the centuries. Thus, it has been said that when the word Shī'ah is used, it refers to them alone.
4. This group champions the call towards bridging the gap between the Shī'ah and the Ahl al-Sunnah. They set up centres, send propagators and

¹ The reason will be discussed later on in the book; one can also refer to *Fatāwā Ibn Taymiyyah* 28/478.

hold conferences through which they wish to spread the idea of 'Islamic unity'.¹

5. This group sings a song about how close their religion is to the Ahl al-Sunnah and that they are falsely accused and oppressed. They go out of their way to defend their religion and publish many books and pamphlets calling towards it. They even study the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah with the sole intent of finding faults therein and refuting them. None of the above can be found to this extent in any other deviant sect.
6. Its excessive attacks upon the Ahl al-Sunnah, especially the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, and its criticism of the fundamental books of the Muslims. This is done on the tens of books which they publish annually. Similarly, they carry out harsh fanatical attacks against anyone who does a critical analysis of their books or their sect, using the excuse that these books widen the gap of disunity and impedes upon the efforts of Islamic unity. Due to this, many writers have held back their pens from writing against them.
7. The great difference of opinion between contemporary writers regarding them caught my attention. One group holds the opinion that they are kuffār and they have overstepped the boundaries of Islam, as stated in the books of Ustādh Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb, Iḥsān Ilāhī Ḥaḥīr, Ibrāhīm Jabḥān² and others. A second group assumes that the Shī'ah are a moderate group, which did not get involved in extremism like the sects of the Bāṭiniyyah. This view can be found in the books of al-Nashshār, Sulaymān Dunyā, Muṣṭafā al-Shak'ah³ and others. The third group is completely confused,

1 Refer to *Fikrat al-Taqrīb Bayn Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Shī'ah* pg. 511.

2 Refer to *Al-Khuṭūṭ al-'Arīḍah* by al-Khaṭīb, *Al-Shī'ah wa l-Sunnah* by Ḥaḥīr and *Tabdīd al-Ḥalām* by Jabḥān.

3 *Nash'at al-Fikr al-Falsafī* by al-Nashshār, vol. 2 pg. 13, *al-Shī'ah wa Ahl-Sunnah* by Sulaymān Dunyā and *Islām bi lā Madh-hab* by Muṣṭafā al-Sha'kah pg. 194.

to the extent that they have queried from the Shī'ī pundits regarding that which Iḥsān Ilāhī Ṣāḥib and Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb have written regarding them.

The truth is often obscured as a result of these differences, or at least, it becomes obscured to many. Therefore, I have given due importance in this book to the noise made, especially by the contemporary Shī'ah, in defence of their religion and in criticism of those who wrote about their religion from the Ahl al-Sunnah. Our predecessors have written regarding the Shī'ah, who they have referred to as the Rawāfiḍ. These writings have had their effects. They include; the books Abū Nu'aym, Ibn Taymiyyah, al-Maqdisī, Firoz'ābādī and all the other books which discusses sects and beliefs. However, these writings were penned before the spread and distribution of Shī'ī books. Thus, only a few of them contain refutations of the writings of the Shī'ah, and none of them discusses the sect in a comprehensive manner, covering all of their beliefs and ideologies.

Furthermore, the truth regarding the Shī'ah — on account of their expertise in dissimulation — is often misunderstood. This is why we find, in a book such as *The Commentary of Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, the opinion that they do not declare the Ṣaḥābah disbelievers and that their only mistake is that they do not grant superiority to Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. We also find Ibn Taymiyyah رحمته الله, despite his careful study of Shī'ism and his criticism thereof, mentioning, “reliable people have told me that some of them believe that pilgrimage to the *Mash-hads* (shrines) is greater in virtue than Ḥajj to the Ka'bah¹,” whereas today, this is a well-known belief established by tens of narrations and many chapters in their essential books.

Similarly, the most important book of the Shī'ah is *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*. Yet you will not find any mention of it by al-Ash'arī, Ibn Ḥazm or Ibn Taymiyyah. This book is the main source of narrations from the Imāms and it is the foundation according to modern day Shī'ah. This could be attributed to another factor, that this religion regularly

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/124.

undergoes a metamorphosis. It does not remain the same for two generations. Al-Mamaqānī, one of their greatest leaders in the present era states:

ان ما يعتبر غلوا عند الشيعة الماضين اصبح اليوم من ضرورات المذهب

That which was considered extremism by the previous Shī'ah is now considered fundamentals of the religion.¹

This constantly changing religion needs to be unmasked and portrayed for what it is in this era.

Another reason why this book is important is that most of the other books, which were written by the former scholars, are mere answers to Shī'ī allegations against the Ahl al-Sunnah on the basis of that which appears in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. These scholars then went on to point out the fact that those narrations were either fabricated, unauthentic or misconstrued by the Shī'ah. However, the Shī'ah do not have the slightest confidence in any of the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. They simply raise these objections to achieve two goals:

Firstly, to occupy the Ahl al-Sunnah with these objections, so that they do not find the time to review their (Shī'ī) books, statements and narrators.

Secondly, to comfort the confused and doubtful among them by claiming that their (bizarre) views are agreed upon by the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Unfortunately (for them), the books of the Shī'ah are available today, like never before. Therefore, these books should be the basis of all studies and critiques, as every sect can only be held accountable for that in which they believe and affirm. As for the contemporary books of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding the Shī'ah, they are very few if compared to the amount that the Shī'ah have written regarding the Ahl al-Sunnah. They are definitely insufficient as far as dealing with the Shī'ah is concerned. Their religion stands upon hundreds of books which serve it, call

1 *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* 3/23

towards it and presents its beliefs and ideologies. Studying these and analysing them would require great effort and lots of work.

I have noticed that these studies (done by the Ahl al-Sunnah) neglect some pertinent aspects of the study of Shī'ism, such as studying their beliefs regarding the basics of dīn, which I have tried to cover in the second chapter of this book. Similarly, they overlook the importance of knowing the views of contemporary Shī'ah, their motives, relationship with older sects and their classical books. I have discussed this in the fourth chapter of this book.

The subject is really vast and it has many aspects to it. It can only be solved by doing a new study which continues until nothing of the Shī'ah remains unknown. This is why I have chosen to tackle the subject academically, in a way that brings to light many new and important discoveries. Perhaps the following two stand out the most;

1. A study of the Shī'ah perspective on the basics of dīn. It is a discussion wherein most of the views are unknown. This is because they conceal it, and none of the Ahl al-Sunnah have delved into it. An entire chapter (chapter two) was dedicated to this in my book.
2. This book unveils certain beliefs which were not studied by anyone previously – to the best of my knowledge. These beliefs include; the Qur'ān is not a proof unless corroborated by the statement of the Imām, most of it was revealed regarding them and their enemies, the belief regarding the appearance of the al-Mahdī, *Ṭīnah*¹ and the claim that divine books were revealed upon the Imāms.²

1 Al-Shaykh al-Tonsawī indicates in his book, *'Aqā'id al-Shī'ah*, to this belief in a very ambiguous manner. Thereafter, he quotes a narration from *al-Kāfi* which also does not explain the reality of this belief.

2 Researchers generally confuse this with the concept of *Tahrīf* (adulteration of the Qur'ān), which is also a view of many, if not all of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah.

I have also written regarding when the idea of *Tahrīf* (adulteration of the Qur'ān) was first introduced into their religion, as well as the first book that was written to prove this lie. I have exposed this book and traced the date and time when it was written. Another fact that I have exposed is that Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah and his book *Minhāj al-Sunnah* played a great role in them changing their approach to ḥadīth and thereafter classifying them as *ṣaḥīḥ* (authentic), *ḍa'īf* (unauthentic) and *muwaththaq* (approved).

The matter of the existence of the al-Mahdī, upon whom the present day Shī'ah base their religion, has also been researched. Important testimonials from the very family of Ḥasan al-'Askarī, the Ahl al-Bayt and Ḥasan al-'Askarī himself were presented. These were taken directly from Shī'ī books. There are many other aspects of this nature, which the reader will come across in this book.

My methodology in this book is that I explain each matter to the extent that if the reader wishes to add on anything, then he will know where to find the appropriate material. This is because I have tried to suffice — as far as the discussed topics are concerned — upon indicating towards them or reproducing new texts, as I have done regarding their belief that Abū Bakr and 'Umar رضي الله عنهما were kāfir and in those texts which expose the extremism of the Shī'ah regarding it, which were quoted by al-Shaykh Mūsā Jār Allāh, Iḥsān Ilāhī Ṣāḥib and others. I have tried to quote texts from the Shī'ah which refer to them in a subtle manner and thereafter I have quoted their explanations from the books of the Shī'ah.

As for the methodology which governed my approach towards tackling this subject and creating the opportunity for more to be added on, I have adopted it because the chapters of this discussion speak for themselves, and they are the most revealing as far as the subject is concerned. I deem it appropriate to indicate to a few aspects of this methodology. Firstly, I started of my journey by going directly to Shī'ī sources instead of referring to secondary sources. This guarantees that the discussion will not be based upon misunderstandings.

Secondly, I tried my utmost to stay within an objective framework, as required by a subject that is as closely related to beliefs as the one that I have researched.

True objectivity demands that one should be absolutely honest when quoting from their books, quote from the most reliable sources according to them, be just when making a decision and try ones best to find the narrations which are authenticated and often quoted in their own sources — as far as this is possible.

Along the course of my research, I have criticised those aspects, the falsehood of which deserved to be exposed and criticised. This does not go against objectivity. Rather, it is the duty of every Muslim to do so. It is unconditionally imperative to denounce in a befitting manner, expose the heinousness of the crime and the evilness of beliefs such as the belief that the Qur’ān has been tempered with, ‘Alī رضي الله عنه is the First, the Last, the Apparent and the Hidden and similar blasphemous beliefs. Choosing not to do so will be a great treachery and a disservice to the Muslim reader.

Thus, I have quoted their beliefs as per my methodology, but wherever I found that the subject required a lengthier critical study, I added on an extra discussion. However, I did not stick to this throughout the book, as certain subjects were such that the fallacious nature thereof was self-evident. It is for this reason that Shaykh Ibn Taymiyyah رحمته الله stated that a proper presentation regarding any deviant is sufficient to prove their deviance. If the presentation is up to standard, there is no need for any other proof. The only reason why doubts have cropped up is because people do not understand the reality and intended meanings of their ambiguous statements which often have multiple meanings.¹

Thus, at times, I sufficed upon a good presentation of the reality of the statements and simply indicating to the falsity thereof, especially in the subsidiary matters. This is unlike my approach towards the greater issues such as the issues of Naṣṣ, the Ṣaḥābah, etc., where I have added a critique to each one of them in the light of the Qur’ān, Sunnah sayings of their Imāms, obvious matters and matters which are agreed upon.

1 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 2/138 (compiled by al-Shaykh ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Qāsim).

In engaging them I will employ the method of internal textual criticism, by comparing their various narrations and thereafter pointing out the contradictions and differences between them as much as possible. The other angle from which I dealt with their arguments was that I criticised them in the light of their very own logic, principles and narrations. This in no way means that I agree with them upon those principles to any extent. It was only for arguments sake that I used those narrations, as they go a long way in exposing the reality of the Shīʿī religion. It exposes the degree of their non-compliance to their own principles and how they pick and choose (without any valid reason) between their narrations.

The ‘reliable’ books of the Shīʿah were the primary sources for the quotations regarding their beliefs. However, I did not overlook the other sources in most cases. The reason being that it will be beneficial for the reader to have both in front of him so that he can compare the two, realise the degree to which the older scholars were conversant with Shīʿism and he can also see the enormous changes that kept on taking place in their religion along the centuries.

Other services that I have rendered in this book are; I have traced all the aḥādīth and statements of the predecessors in this discussion back to their sources, presented a brief overview regarding the groups and sects mentioned, explained the technical terminology, wrote basic biographies regarding those who introduced some of the Shīʿī beliefs and I explained whatever else I thought needs explanation. I chose not to introduce the reader to every single influential personality who appears herein, as this will preoccupy the reader from the actual subject, and this can easily be found in the books of history and biographies. Rather, I presented a summary regarding all the sects and groups who have been mentioned as this is more relevant to the subject matter.

My study demanded that I overcome a few difficulties:

1. The narrations of the Shīʿah do not have an index, nor is it systematic like that of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Due to this, I had to read through a lot of the narrations, to the extent that I read all the volumes of *Al-Biḥār*. I would

read every narration in certain chapters. I also read *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* and I paged through *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah*. In each chapter, the narrations that I needed were in the hundreds, which made my task difficult as I could not write anything until I read all those narrations. Further, I had to continuously refer to the commentaries of *al-Kāfī* such as *Sharḥ al-Jāmi'* of al-Māzindarānī to understand the interpretation of their scholars.

2. In search of Shī'ī books, I travelled to Egypt, Iraq, Bahrain, Kuwait and Pakistan. As a result, I found many important sources, which were beneficial and thus added to the chapters and sections of this book.
3. The lengthy period of time that was covered in this discussion, i.e. from the inception of Shī'ism until today. I had in front of me tens of Shī'ī books from many different eras. Hence I spent a great amount of time looking them up and figuring out the development of Shī'ī doctrine along the centuries.

The Sources of My Book

I have relied in my study, upon the books which they consider reliable from the books of Tafsīr, Ḥadīth, *Rijāl* (biographies), 'Aqā'id, *Firaq* (sects) and *Uṣūl* (principles).

From the books of Tafsīr, I referred to:

1. *Tafsīr* ('Alī ibn Ibrāhīm) *al-Qummī*, which is referred to as the mother of all Tafsīrs by them.¹ The narrations thereof have been authenticated by the one who they label al-Imām al-Akbar in this era, i.e. Abū al-Qāsim al-Khū'ī. He says:

ولذا نحكم بوثاقه جميع مشايخ على بن ابراهيم القمي الذي روى عنهم في تفسيره مع انتهاء السند الى
احد المعصومين

1 Preface of *Tafsīr al-Qummī* pg. 10.

This is why we pass the judgement regarding all the teachers of ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, from whom he narrates that they are reliable as long as the isnād reaches one of the infallibles.¹

Al-Qummī is considered an authority in the field of ḥadīth by them. They believe that he was consistent and reliable² and he was a contemporary of Imām al-‘Askarī. He died in the year 307 A.H.³

2. *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī*, which was described by a contemporary scholar of theirs (Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Ṭabaṭabā’ī) as:

احسن كتاب الف قديما فى بابہ و اوثق ما ورثناه من قداماء مشايخنا من كتب التفسير بالمأثور فقد تلقاه علماء هذا الشأن منذ الف عام الى يومنا هذا من غير ان يذكر بقدر او يغمض فيه بطرف

The best classical book regarding the subject and the most reliable of all of that which we have inherited from our former scholars on the subject of Tafsīr by means of the narrations. The scholars of the field have accepted it for the past thousand years without mentioning any criticism or turning away from anything therein.⁴

3. *Tafsīr Furāt* of Furāt ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Furāt al-Kūfī — who was one of their scholars in the latter part of the third century and the beginning of the fourth century.⁵ Their scholar, al-Majlisī has authenticated it saying:

اخبار تفسير فرات موافقة لما وصل الينا من الاحاديث المعتبرة

The narrations of *Tafsīr Furāt* conform to that which has reached us from the reliable aḥādīth.⁶

1 Abū al-Qāsim al-Khū’ī: *Muḥjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* 1/63.

2 *Rijāl al-Najāshī* pg. 197.

3 *Al-Dhar’ah* 4/302, Preface of *Tafsīr al-Qummī* pg. 8.

4 Al-Ṭabaṭabā’ī: preface regarding the book and its author: Ṣāj.

5 Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī: *Nawābiḥ al-Ruwāt* pg. 216.

6 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/37. Refer to the preface of *Tafsīr al-Furāt* by Muḥammad ‘Alī al-Awrdabādī, in which it is stated that this book is among their reliable sources, according to both, the former and latter day scholars.

The above mentioned are the most important classical tafsīrs that exist among them today.¹ I have referred to them with regards to their belief concerning the Qur’ān among others. I did not only suffice with accurately quoting from them but also added the writings of their latter day reliable scholars such as:

1. *Tafsīr al-Şāfi* by their scholar, Muḥammad Muḥsin, commonly known as al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī. He is also described as “the erudite scholar, the researcher, the one who delves into fine matters, the highly appreciated and the glorious one.”²
2. *Al-Burhān fī Tafsīr al-Qur’ān* by Hāshim ibn Sulaymān al-Baḥrānī (d. 1107 or 1109 A.H.). He is described by them as “the erudite scholar, the reliable and consistent one, the knowledgeable Muḥaddith and the fully conversant critic.”³
3. *Mir’āt al-Anwār wa Mishkāt al-Asrār* or *Muqaddimat al-Burhān* by their scholar Abū al-Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad al-‘Āmilī al-Fatūnī, the student of al-Majlisī — the author of *Al-Biḥār* (d. 1140 A.H.). The author of *Lu’lu’at al-Baḥrayn* says that he was a researcher and he was one who would delve into fine matters.⁴ The author of *Rowḍāt al-Jannāt* says:

من اعظم فقهاءنا المتأخرين

He was from the greatest jurists of the latter day scholars.⁵

1 As opposed to *Tafsīr al-Tibyān* of al-Tūsī and *Majma‘ al-Bayān* of al-Ṭabarsī, regarding which some of their scholars have said that they were written in accordance to the practice of dissimulation, as will be explained.

2 Al-Ardabīlī: *Jāmi‘ al-Ruwāt* 2/42.

3 Refer to *Amal al-Āmāl* 2/341, Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī: *Lu’lu’at al-Baḥrayn* pg. 63, al-Balādī: *Anwār al-Badrayn* pg. 127.

4 Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī: *Lu’lu’at al-Baḥrān* pg. 107.

5 Al-Khuwānsārī: *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* pg. 658 second print, al-Zarandī: *Tarjumat al-Mu‘allif* (printed along with *Mir’āt al-Anwār*).

Their scholar, al-Nūrī refers to him as *al-Ḥujjah* (the proof), and he says regarding his book:

The like of it has not been authored.¹

The author of *Al-Dharīʿah*² states the same.

There were other books of Tafsīr of theirs that I have referred to and I mentioned them after mentioning the ones that I have referred to and I confirmed them from Shīʿī books. All the former scholars have held the view that the Qurʾān had been adulterated. There can be no doubt that a person who holds a belief like this cannot ever be from the Muslims, yet you will see the quotations wherein they have praised these scholars of theirs.

From their books of Ḥadīth (which are their narrations from the Imāms), I have referred to their seminal works. They are:

1. The four classical books; *al-Kāfī*, *Al-Tahdhīb*, *Al-Istibṣār* and *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh*. Their contemporary scholar, Muḥammad Ṣādiq al-Ṣadr says:

ان الشيعة...مجموعة على اعتبار الكتب الاربعة و قائمة بصحة كل ما فيها من روايات

The Shīʿah... are unanimous upon accepting the four books and believing that all the narrations therein are authentic.³

2. The four later books; *Al-Wāfī*, *Biḥār al-Anwār*, *al-Wasāʾil* and *Mustadrak al-Wasāʾil*. Thus, there seminal books are eight in total. A contemporary Shīʿī scholar, Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-Ḥāʾirī states:

و اما صحاح الامامية فهي ثمانية اربعة منها للمحمدين الثلاثة الاوائل و ثلاثة بعدها للمحمدين الثلاثة الاواخر و ثامنهما لمحمد حسين المرحوم المعاصر النورى

1 *Mustadrak al-Wasāʾil* 3/385.

2 Aghā Buzurg: *Al-Dharīʿah* 20/264.

3 *Al-Shīʿah* pg. 127.

As for the authentic books of the Shī'ah, they are eight. Four of them were written by the first three Muḥammads, four were written by the last three Muḥammads and the last one was written by Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Marḥūm al-Nūrī — the contemporary.¹

I have discussed these sources under the chapter “their beliefs regarding the Sunnah”. The two books which I referred to most from these eight were *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* and *Biḥār al-Anwār*. The reason behind that was that particular attention was paid towards beliefs in these books. Also, the Shī'ah attach a greater importance to these two books. Al-Ṣadr comments regarding *al-Kāfi*:

It (*al-Kāfi*) is regarded by the Shī'ah as the most authentic of the four books.² It contains a total of 16199 narrations. If the author of *al-Kāfi* did not take the responsibility of gathering the narrations from the Imāms in his book, only a minute amount would have remained.

He adds, ‘It has been reported that *al-Kāfi* was presented to the Mahdī who remarked:

كاف لشيعتنا

It is *Kāfi* (sufficient) for our sect.³

These are the statement of al-Ṣadr, which he attributes to all the Shī'ah in general. This is why Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb says, “the Shī'ah grant the same position to *al-Kāfi* that the Muslims grant to *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*.”⁴ However, this statement of al-Khaṭīb is a bit inaccurate, as their reliance

1 *Minhāj 'Amalī lī l-Taqrīb* (An essay by the Rāfiḍī Muḥammad al-Ḥā'irī which is part of the book *al-Waḥdat al-Islāmiyyah* pg. 233).

2 *Al-Shī'ah* pg. 133.

3 *Al-Shī'ah* pg. 122, *Al-Khuwānsārī: Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 6/116, *Muqaddimat al-Kāfi* by Ḥasan 'Alī pg. 25.

4 *Al-Khuṭūṭ al-'Arīḍah* pg. 25.

upon *al-Kāfī* is far greater than this extreme. This is apparent from their statement that *al-Kāfī* was written when they had direct contact with their al-Mahdī and it was presented to one of those who they consider infallible. This is equivalent to the Ahl al-Sunnah saying that *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* was presented to Rasūlullāh ﷺ... The Imām, according to them, holds the same position as a Nabī. They say:

كانت منابع اطلاعات الكليني قطيعة الاعتبار لان باب العلم و استعلام حال تلك الكتب بواسطة سفراء
القائم كان مفتوحا عليه لكونهم معه في بلد واحد بغداد

The sources of al-Kulaynī's knowledge were definitely reliable. This is because the doors of knowledge and ascertaining the credibility of those books¹ were open for him through the means of the ambassadors of al-Qā'im², as they were in the same city as him, i.e. Baghdad.³

With regards to *Al-Biḥār*, they have glorified it, as will appear in this book. They have even said:

المرجع الوحيد لتحقيق معارف المذهب

It is the only source for researching the deep aspects of the madh-hab.⁴

3. I have even referred to the books of those scholars who they consider reliable. They regard these books to be just as reliable as the four books. Some of them are:

- I. The book of *Sulaym ibn Qays*. This is the first Shī'ī book that surfaced,

1 Which were gathered, in *al-Kāfī*.

2 Their awaited Mahdī. His ambassadors were his four doors, as will be explained under the chapter of *ghaybah* (occultation).

3 Al-Ḥā'irī: *Minhāj 'Amālī lī l-Taqrīb* (in the book *al-Waḥdat al-Islāmiyyah* pg. 333), refer also to Ibn Ṭāwūs: *Kashf al-Maḥajjah* pg. 159.

4 Al-Bahbūdī: *Muqaddimat Al-Biḥār* pg. 19.

as stated by Ibn al-Nadīm.¹ It is from their reliable and fundamental books.² We had an encounter with this book and its author in the discussion regarding the belief that the Qur’ān was adulterated.³

II. The books of their scholar, Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (d. 381 A.H.), such as *al-Towḥīd*, *Thawāb al-A‘māl*, *Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā*, *Ma‘ānī al-Akhbār*, *al-Amālī* and others. All of his books are “no less famous than the four books upon which the foundation lays in these times.”⁴ There are only five books that are excluded from this, i.e. I did not refer to them.⁵

III. The books of Shaykh al-Ṭā‘ifāh, Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī (d. 460 A.H.). They are just as famous and reliable as the books of Ibn Bābawayh, with the exception of one.⁶

I have also referred to other books of their scholars including all of those which were authenticated by al-Majlisī in the first volume of his *Biḥār*.⁷ I have indicated towards some of their authentications of these books during the course of the discussion. The authentications of the books from which I only quote once are mentioned along with the quotations therefrom.

From their reliable books of ‘Aqā’id, I have referred to the following:

1. *I’tiqādāt Ibn Bābawayh*

1 Refer to *al-Fahrist* pg. 219, *Al-Dharī‘ah* 2/152, *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 4/67 claims that “it was the first book to be authored and compiled in Islam.”

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/32.

3 Refer to pg. 221.

4 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/26.

5 They are *al-Hidāyah*, *Ṣifāt al-Shī‘ah*, *Faḍā’il al-Shī‘ah*, *Muṣādafat al-Ikhwān*, *Faḍā’il al-Ash-hur* and *Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/26.

6 *al-Amālī* (refer to *Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/27).

7 Pg. 29

2. *Awā'il al-Maqālāt* of al-Mufīd and *Taṣḥīḥ Al-I'tiqād* by him as well.
3. *Nahj al-Mustarshidīn* by Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī
4. *Al-I'tiqādāt* by al-Majlisī (author of *Al-Biḥār*)
5. *'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah* by al-Muẓaffar (a contemporary)
6. *'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah al-Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* by al-Zanjānī (a contemporary) as well as others.

As for those beliefs which are confined to them, I have referred to, in addition to the above mentioned, that which were written specifically regarding these beliefs. As an example, on the topic of Ghaybah, I referred to *Kitāb al-Ghaybah* by their scholar Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Nu'mānī—who is one of their scholars from the third century. Al-Majlisī, before quoting al-Mufīds praise for this book¹, comments:

وكتاب النعماني من اجل الكتب

The book of al-Nu'mānī is one of the most outstanding books.²

Added to that, I referred to the *Kitāb al-Ghaybah* of al-Ṭūsī and *Ikmāl al-Dīn* by Ibn Bābawayh among others. Regarding their belief of Raj'ah, I referred to that which was written by their scholar, al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī. His book is named *al-Īqāz min al-Haj'ah bi l-Burhān 'alā al-Raj'ah*. Similar is the case of the other beliefs.

I have also referred to that which some of their scholars have written regarding groups and sects, namely *al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq* by their scholar Sa'd ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Ash'arī al-Qummī (d. 301 A.H.) and *Firaq al-Shī'ah* by their scholar Ḥasan ibn Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī — one of their third century scholars.

وهما كتابان وصلا اليها من بين كتب فرق الشيعة الضائعة

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/31.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/31.

They are the two books which have reached us from the books of the Shī'ah that were lost.¹

As from the books on Rijāl, I referred to their reliable sources on the subject, especially their four books. They have said:

اهم الكتب فى هذا الموضوع من مؤلفات المتقدمين هى اربعة كتب عليها المعول فى هذا الباب وهى:

١. معرفة الناقلين عن الائمة الصادقين لابی عمرو محمد بن عمر بن عبد العزيز الكشى (من

شييوخهم فى القرن الرابع) الذى يعرف ب(رجال الكشى)

٢. كتاب الرجال لأبى العباس احمد بن على النجاشى المتوفى سنة (٤٦٠ هـ) المعروف ب(رجال

النجاشى)

٣. كتاب الرجال لشيخ الطائفة ابى جعفر محمد بن الحسن بن على الطوسى المتوفى سنة (٤٦٠

هـ) المعروف ب(رجال الطوسى)

٤. كتاب الفهرست للشيخ الطوسى

The following four books are the most important books which were authored regarding this subject from the books of the former scholars. They are the decisive sources of this subject.

1. *Ma'rifat al-Nāqilīn 'An al-A'immat al-Ṣādiqīn* by Abū 'Amr Muḥammad ibn 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Kashshī (one of their scholars from the fourth century) which is also known as *Rijāl al-Kashshī*.
2. *Kitāb al-Rijāl* by Abū al-'Abbās Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-Najāshī (d. 460) which commonly known as *Rijāl al-Najāshī*.
3. *Kitāb al-Rijāl* by Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifah Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn 'Alī al-Ṭūsī (d. 460 A.H.) commonly known as *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī*.
4. *Kitāb al-Fahrist* by Shaykh al-Ṭūsī.²

1 Muḥammad Jawwād Mashkūr, preface of the book *al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq* by al-Qummī pg. 11.

2 Aḥmad al-Ḥusaynī: *Muqaddimat Rijāl al-Kashshī al-A'lamī* print, Karbala pg. 4. Refer also to Ḥasan al-Muṣṭafawī: *Muqaddimat Rijāl al-Kashshī*-Iranian print pg. 12, Āghā Buzurg: *Al-Dhar'ah ilā Taṣnīf al-Shī'ah* 10/80-81.

The book which I quoted most extensively from was *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, as they regard it to be the most important, oldest and most reliable book on the subject of *Rijāl*. This is because it is a book of al-Kashshī, who is, according to them “reliable, well-versed with narrations and narrators and he has perfect beliefs.”¹ The next book which I quoted from abundantly was the systemised and summarised book of Shaykh al-Ṭāʾifah al-Ṭūsī. One of their scholars, al-Mustafawī states:

أقدم هذه الكتب: هو رجال الكشي الذى لخصه شيخ الطائفة... فكفى لهذا الكتاب المنيف شرفا و اعتبارا

The oldest of these books is *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, which was summarised by Shaykh al-Ṭāʾifah... this is sufficient an honour and a seal of reliability for this outstanding book.²

In a nutshell, I quoted no other sources besides their most reliable books in my depiction of the religion. Added to that, I only mentioned those beliefs of theirs regarding which they are excessive narrations and their priests have admitted to believing in them. At times, there are plenty of narrations, thus I merely indicate towards that by mentioning the amount thereof and the names of the chapters of those subjects which I discuss. The narrations quoted are accompanied by that which I could find from their authentications and judgements regarding them, on the basis of their authentication system.

Great pains were undertaken to maintain the above mentioned procedures. Hence it cannot be said that we have used some of their rare and weak narrations which are not a true representation of the religion. In most cases, I have made it a point to reproduce their quotations verbatim, as per demands of objectivity and precision in quoting and attribution of quotations. This is also required by the academic methodology, especially as far as the speech of the opposition is concerned.

1 *Fahrist al-Ṭūsī* pg. 171-172.

2 *Muqaddimat al-Mustafawī li Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 12.

Outline of the Discussion

This discussion comprises of an introduction which is followed by five sections.

The introduction includes an explanation of Shī'ism, its inception, historical stems, sects, the different titles of the Shī'ah and the sects thereof.

Section One: This deals with their beliefs regarding the sources of Islam. It is made up of three chapters:

Chapter One — Their beliefs regarding the Qur'ān.

Chapter Two — Their beliefs regarding the Sunnah.

Chapter Three — Their beliefs regarding Ijmā'.

Section Two: Four chapters were dedicated to their beliefs regarding the fundamentals of Islam.

Chapter One — Their beliefs regarding their deity.

Chapter Two — Their beliefs regarding their master.

Chapter Three — Their beliefs regarding the names and attributes of Allah.

Chapter Four — Their beliefs regarding īmān and its components.

Section Three: In this section, their fundamental beliefs and principles which are confined to them have been discussed. The following beliefs of theirs have been covered:

1. Imāmah — Their views regarding the Ṣaḥābah, Ahl al-Bayt, Muslim rulers, judges, scholars, Islamic cities and their branches, sects and the ummah have also been touched upon in this chapter.
2. 'Iṣmah (infallibility)
3. Taqiyyah (dissimulation)

4. *Al-Mahdiyyah wa l-Ghaybah* (Madism and occultation).
5. *Al-Raj'ah*
6. *Al-Zuhūr*
7. *Al-Badā*
8. *Al-Ṭīnah*

Section Four: Present day Shī'ahs and their association with their predecessors. This section has four chapters:

Chapter One — Their relationship with their classical sources.

Chapter Two — Their relationship with their older sects.

Chapter Three — The relationship between former and latter day Shī'ah as far as beliefs are concerned.

Chapter Four — The state of the Ayatollahs.

Section Five: The judgement regarding them and their effects upon the Islamic world. This section has two chapters:

Chapter One — The judgement regarding them.

Chapter Two — Their effects upon the Islamic world.

Conclusion: A presentation of the most important conclusions that were reached along the course of the discussion.

At the end of this preface, I supplicate to Allah the most high, the one who has complete control to forgive my scholar and teacher Dr Muḥammad Rāshid Sālīm and shower him with mercy and happiness. May He engulf him in His infinite clemency and forgiveness and may He grant him residence in His vast gardens of heaven, as he oversaw this book from its very beginning until it was completed. He then granted me permission to print it, but left the world before it saw the light of day, may Allah's unlimited mercy be upon him. I benefitted greatly from

his directives and knowledge, as he was generous towards me with his virtue and character.

His life was spent in the paths of knowledge and jihād and he was even imprisoned on two occasions. He left behind highly beneficial efforts. It was his heart's desire to establish, along with his students of the faculty, what he would call "The Ahl al-Sunnah" library, which would publish the classical books of 'Aqīdah of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and it would refute the beliefs of those who have opposed the majority. I ask Allah to reward him for his intentions and actions a beautiful reward, and may He allow his students to bring to reality his dreams, so that they can continue on the path, following his footsteps.

I also wish to thank and acknowledge the favours of my teacher Dr Sālim ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Dakhīl, who agreed to oversee the completion of the book, reviewed its different stages, checked on its final steps and expressed satisfaction regarding its set-up. His suggestions and instructions were indeed helpful.

I ask Allah to grant the best of rewards to all those who helped me in any way in compiling this book. May Allah send mercy and salutations upon our Nabī Muḥammad and all of his companions and family.

And all praise belongs to Allah.

Expounding upon:

1. A linguistic study of the word 'Shī'ah'.
2. The word 'Shī'ah' in the Qur'ān and its meanings.
3. The word 'Shī'ah' in the Sunnah and its meanings.
4. The word 'Shī'ah' in the ḥadīth books of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah and its meanings.
5. The word 'Shī'ah' in the light of history.
6. The definition of 'Shī'ah' in the books of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah.
7. The definition of 'Shī'ah' in the books of the Ismā'īlis.
8. The definition of 'Shī'ah' from other sources.
9. The preferred definition of the word 'Shī'ah'.
10. Inception of the Shī'ah.
11. Sects of the Shī'ah.
12. The different titles of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah Shī'ah.
13. Sects of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah.

Definition of the Word 'Shī'ah'

The Linguistic Definition:

Ibn Durayd (d. 321 A.H.) says:

A certain person is from the Shī'ah of another person, i.e. he subscribes to his views. You have done *tashyī'* (a tense of the word Shī'ah) of a person regarding a matter, when you have helped him to do it, and you have done *mushāya'ah* (another tense) of a man regarding a matter when you have joined him in doing it.¹

1 Ibn Durayd: *Jamharāt al-Lughah* 3/63

Al-Azharī (d. 370 A.H.) says:

Shī'ah are the helpers of a man and his followers. Any group of people who unite regarding a certain matter are called Shī'ah. Groups of Shī'ah are called Shiya' and Ashyā'. As for the Shī'ah, they are a people who display love for the family of Nabī Muḥammad ﷺ and support them.

You have done tashyī' of the fire when you place in it that which causes it to flare up. It is said, "I have done tashyī' of a certain person," i.e. I went out with him to bid him farewell. It is also said, "we did tashyī' of the month of Ramaḍān with six (fasts) of Shawāl," i.e. we followed it up with six fasts. The Arabs say, "I will come to you tomorrow or it's *Shay'* (the day after tomorrow)." Shī'ah is that which follows. Shiya' are sects who follow one-another but all of them are not the same.¹

Al-Jowharī (d. 400 A.H.) says:

A man has become a Shī'ah, i.e. he claimed that which the Shī'ah claim. All people who agree upon a matter and some of them follow the views of the others are shiya'. Dhū al-Rimmah said, "the riders made up a story regarding their Ashyā'² (i.e. regarding their companions³)."

Ibn Manzūr (d. 711 A.H.) says:

Shī'ah are the followers and supporters of a person. The plural form of the word is Shiya' and the grand plural is Ashyā'. The original meaning of the word Shī'ah is: a group of people. It is used for a single person, two people, as well as a group of people — male or female. All of the above is expressed with one word and it has the same meaning in each case. This word is now mostly used for those who support 'Alī and his household, to

1 Al-Azharī: *Tahdhīb al-Lughah* 3/61

2 *Dīwān Dhī l-Rimmah* pg. 4

3 *Al-Ṣiḥāḥ* 3/1240, researched by Aḥmad 'Abd al-Ghafūr 'Aṭār

the extent that it has become synonymous with them. Hence, when it is said, “he is from the Shī‘ah,” it is immediately realised that he subscribes to their views. Similarly, when it is said, “this is according to the Shī‘ah madh-hab,” it is understood that this is their view. The origin of that is from mushāya‘ah which means following and complying.

The Shī‘ah are a group of people who follow the views of others. It is said, “Tashāya‘a, the people have become Shī‘ah,” when they split into groups. It is also said, “the man has become a Shī‘ī,” when he makes the same claims as the Shī‘ah. Shāya‘a, Shiyā and Shayya‘a mean that he followed him. When it is said that he did Shiyā‘ of the next person upon that, it means that he strengthened him.¹

Al-Zabīdī (d. 1205) says:

Whoever helps a person and becomes part of his group is his Shī‘ah. The origin of Shī‘ah is from Mushāya‘ah which means to follow. It is said that the middle letter of Shī‘ah is a “ي” and from the word Shawwa‘a (he gathered) his people. This word is now mostly used to refer to those who support ‘Alī and his household... they are a nation whose numbers cannot be guessed and they are innovators. The extremists among them are the Imāmiyyah Muntaziriyyah. They curse Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنه. The extremists among them even go as far as declaring them disbelievers. Some of them are heretics.²

Thus, the words: Shī‘ah, Tashayyu‘ and Mushāya‘ah, as far as the literal meaning is concerned, centre around meanings such as following, helping, agreeing with, uniting upon a matter or gathering upon it. Thereafter, as stated by the authors of *al-Lisān*, *Al-Qāmūs* and *Tāj al-‘Arūs*, they were mostly used to refer to those who supported ‘Alī and his household. This usage needs to be reviewed. This is

1 *Lisān al-‘Arab*

2 *Tāj al-‘Arūs* 5/405. Refer to the dictionaries under the alphabets شاع . *Al-Qāmūs* 3/47, *Al-Bustānī: Qaṭr al-Muḥīṭ* 1/1100, *al-Ṭarīḥ: Majma‘ al-Baḥrayn* 4/355

because, if a person reflects upon the literal meaning of the word Shī'ah, which implies following and helping, and thereafter he casts a glance at majority of the sects upon whom this word is used, it will become clear to him that this usage is linguistically incorrect.

None of these groups follow the Ahl al-Bayt. The reality is that they oppose their ways and they have chosen a path that has nothing to do with the Ahl al-Bayt. Perhaps, this is what was perceived by Sharīk ibn 'Abd Allāh when he was asked, "who was more virtuous, Abū Bakr or 'Alī?" He replied, "Abū Bakr." The questioner surprisingly retorted, "is this what you say, whereas you are a Shī'ī?" He replied, "yes, whoever says otherwise is not a Shī'ī. By the oath of Allah, 'Alī ascended these steps and then announced, 'listen well! Indeed the best of this ummah after its Nabī is Abū Bakr and thereafter 'Umar!' Thus, how can we reject his statement and belie him? By the oath of Allah, he was not a liar!"¹

Imām Sharīk understood that all those who do not follow 'Alī عليه السلام do not deserve to be called Shī'ah, as the original meaning and reality of the word Shī'ah is to follow. This is why many scholars preferred calling them "Rāfiḍah".² The real followers of the Ahl al-Bayt as well as those who were referred to as Shī'ah were also forced to discard this name as it had become synonymous with the innovators who opposed the Ahl al-Bayt. This is pointed out by the author of *Tuḥfah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah*, who says:

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/7-8, researched by Dr Muḥammad Rashād Sālim. Refer to 'Abd al-Jabbār al-Hamdānī: *Tathbīt Dalā'il al-Nubuwwah* 1/63.

Ibn Taymiyyah says: "It has been narrated in eighty different ways from 'Alī عليه السلام that he announced on the mimbar of Kūfah, 'the best of this ummah after its Nabī is Abū Bakr and then 'Umar.' *Al-Bukhārī* and others have narrated it." Refer to *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/137. The same has been recorded in the books of the Shī'ah. Refer to *Talkhīṣ al-Shāfi* (2/428, as quoted by Iḥsān Ilāhī Ṣāḥib in *al-Shī'ah wa Ahl al-Bayt* pg. 52).

2 As an example refer to al-Milṭī: *Al-Tanbīh wa l-Radd* pg. 18, al-Baghdādī: *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg.21 al-Isfarāyīnī: *al-Tabṣīr fīl-Dīn* pg. 16, Al-Sakāī: *al-Burhān* pg. 36, al-Farmānī: *Risālat fī Bayān Madhāhib Ba'd al-Firaq al-Ḍallah* paper number two (from the manuscript), Abū al-Ḥasan al-'Irāqī: *Dhikr al-Firaq al-Ḍawāl* paper number 12 (from the manuscript).

The former Shī'ah discarded the name Shī'ah when it became the title of the Rawāfiḍ and Ismā'īlī. They began calling themselves the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah.¹

The Word 'Shī'ah' in the Qur'ān and its Meaning

The root letters of “شَيْعَ” appear twelve times in the Qur'ān.² Imām Ibn al-Jowzī³ summarised their meanings in the following words:

The Exegetes have mentioned that the word “شَيْعَ” appears with four different meanings in the Qur'ān. One meaning is sects. This is as in the verses

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ فَرَّقُوا دِينَهُمْ وَكَانُوا شَيْعًا

Indeed, those who have divided their religion and become sects.⁴

وَلَقَدْ أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ قَبْلِكَ فِي شَيْعِ الْأَوَّلِينَ

And We had certainly sent [messengers] before you, [O Muḥammad], among the sects of the former peoples.⁵

جَعَلَ أَهْلَهَا شِيَعًا

Made its people into factions,⁶

1 *Tuḥfah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* pg. 25-26 (of the manuscript)

2 Refer to *Al-Mu'jam al-Mufahras li-Alfāz al-Qur'ān* pg. 18

3 Abū al-Faraj 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī al-Taymī al-Baghdādī, famously known as Ibn al-Jowzī. The author of many works on different subjects including Tafsīr, Ḥadīth, Fiqh etc. Among his works are *Jāmi' al-Masānīd*, *al-Muntaẓam* and others. He passed away in the year 597 A.H. Refer to Ibn al-'Imād: *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 4/329, al-Yāfi'ī: *Mir'āt al-Jinān* 3/489-493, *Mu'jam al-Mu'allifīn* 5/157

4 Sūrah al-An'ām: 159

5 Sūrah al-Hijr: 10

6 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 4. Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī says, “made its people into factions: i.e. sects.” *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 20/27. Also refer to Abū 'Ubaydah: *Majāz al-Qur'ān* 1/194.

مِنَ الَّذِينَ فَرَّقُوا دِينَهُمْ وَكَانُوا شِبَعًا

[Or] of those who have divided their religion and become sects,¹

The **second** meaning which is implied by its usage is family and lineage. This meaning is implied in the following verse:

هَذَا مِنْ شِيعَتِهِ وَهَذَا مِنْ عَدُوِّهِ

... one from his faction and one from among his enemy.²

The **third** meaning for which this word is used in the Qur’ān is “the people of a religion”. This meaning is implied in the following verses:

ثُمَّ لَنَنْزِعَنَّ مِنْ كُلِّ شِيعَةٍ أَيُّهُمْ أَشَدُّ عَلَى الرَّحْمَنِ عِتِيًّا

Then We will surely extract from every sect those of them who were worst against the Most Merciful in insolence.³

وَلَقَدْ أَهْلَكْنَا أَشْيَاعَكُمْ فَهَلْ مِنْ مُدَكِّرٍ

And We have already destroyed your kinds, so is there any who will remember?⁴

كَمَا فَعَلَ بِأَشْيَاعِهِمْ مِنْ قَبْلُ

As was done with their kind before.⁵

1 Sūrah al-Rūm: 32

2 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 15. Ibn Qutaybah says, “the meaning of ‘one from his faction’ is: one of his companions from Banū Isrā’īl.” *Tafsīr Gharīb al-Qur’ān* pg. 329. Refer to Abū Ḥayyān: *Tuḥfah al-Arīb bi mā fi l-Qur’ān min al-Gharīb* pg. 153.

3 Sūrah Maryam: 69

4 Sūrah al-Qamar: 51

5 Sūrah al-Saba: 54

وَإِنَّ مِنْ شِيعَتِهِ لَإِبْرَاهِيمَ

And indeed, among his kind was Ibrahīm.¹

Fourthly, this word is used to express the meaning “different desires”. This is the case in the verse:

يَلْبِسَكُمْ شِيَعًا

or to confuse you (so you become) sects...^{2,3}

Ibn al-Qayyim⁴ highlights, in an important passage that he wrote, that the word Shī'ah and Ashyā' are mostly used negatively. Even in the Qur'ān, it is used mostly in a negative sense. This is evident from the verses:

ثُمَّ لَنَنْزِعَنَّ مِنْ كُلِّ شِيعَةٍ أَيُّهُمْ أَشَدُّ عَلَى الرَّحْمَنِ عِتِيًّا

Then We will surely extract from every sect those of them who were worst against the Most Merciful in insolence.⁵

1 Sūrah al-Ṣāffāt: 83

2 Sūrah al-An'ām: 65

3 Ibn al-Jowzī: *Nuzhat al-A'yun al-Nawāzīr* pg. 376-377. Al-Dāmaghānī added a fifth meaning, i.e. to spread something. He backed this by citing the verse, “indeed, those who like that immorality should be spread [or publicised] among those who have believed...” (Sūrah al-Nūr: 19) Similarly, Ibn al-Jowzī explained one meaning of the word to be family and lineage, which he stated is implied in the following verse:

هَذَا مِنْ شِيعَتِهِ وَهَذَا مِنْ عَدُوِّهِ

...one from his faction and one from among his enemy.

However, al-Dāmaghānī added another meaning to the word, i.e. army, and he cited this same verse as proof. The remainder of the meanings have been agreed upon by both scholars. Refer to al-Dāmaghānī: *Qāmūs al-Qur'ān* pg. 271, researched by 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Ahl

4 Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr ibn Ayyūb al-Zarī al-Dimashqī. Better known as Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jowziyyah. Passed away in the year 751 A.H. Author of books including *A'lām al-Muwaqqi'īn* and *Zād al-Ma'ād*. Refer to Ibn Kathīr: *Al-Bidāyah wa l-Nihāyah* 14/234, Ibn Ḥajar: *Al-Durar al-Kāminah* 3/400

5 Sūrah Maryam: 69

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ فَرَّقُوا دِينَهُمْ وَكَانُوا شِبَعًا

Indeed, those who have divided their religion and become sects.¹

وَحِيلَ بَيْنَهُمْ وَبَيْنَ مَا يَشْتَهُونَ كَمَا فُعِلَ بِأَشْيَاعِهِمْ مِّن قَبْلُ

And prevention will be placed between them and what they desire,
as was done with their kind before.²

He then explains the reason:

That is because, and Allah knows best, the word *Shī'ah* implies being spread out and separated, which is the opposite of co-operation and unity. This is also the reason why this word is only used for deviant sects, viz. they differ and separate from the truth.³

These are the uses of the word *Shī'ah* in the *Qur'ān* along with their meanings. They do not imply, in any way, the famous understanding of the word *Shī'ah*. This is quite obvious to the one who reads these verses. Despite this, we were amazed to find that some *Shī'ah* attempt to hijack the word on some occasions to refer to their deviant group, thus interpreting the Book of Allah against its meaning. They force upon the *Qur'ān* meanings that are not accommodated by the *Qur'ān*, in an effort to distort the *Qur'ān*. This is the result of their disbelief in the *Qur'ān*.

The following is reported in their *ḥadīth* books, under the explanation of the verse:

وَإِنَّ مِنْ شِيعَتِهِ لَإِبْرَاهِيمَ

1 *Sūrah al-An'ām*: 159

2 *Sūrah al-Saba'*: 54

3 *Badā'ī al-Fawā'id* 1/155. This refers to most cases, not all. This is important to note as it positively mentioned in the verse, "And indeed, among his kind was Abraham."

And indeed, among his kind was Abraham.¹

Indeed Ibrāhīm was from the Shī'ah of 'Alī.²

This explanation contradicts the context of this verse of the Qur'ān and the fundamentals of Islam. It is a concoction of the extremist Rawāfiḍ, who grant superiority to their Imāms over the ambiyā'.³ This ludicrous explanation, or rather distortion, demotes the greatest of ambiyā' after Nabī ﷺ into a follower of 'Alī رضي الله عنه. Islamically, the invalidity of this claim is obvious. However, it is also proven baseless by common sense as well as history. It was concocted by one who failed miserably at his job (of concoction).

The Ahl al-Sunnah have explained this verse to mean that Ibrāhīm was from the group of Nūḥ عليه السلام and upon the same path as him⁴, as narrated from the pious predecessors. This explanation conforms to the context of the verse⁵, as the verses prior to this verse were all in reference to Nūḥ عليه السلام. A noteworthy fact is that one Shī'ī opted for the explanation of the Ahl al-Sunnah, discarding the drivel puked out by his people.⁶

1 Sūrah al-Ṣāffāt: 83

2 Al-Baḥrānī: *Tafsīr al-Burhān* 4/20, *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/323, Al-Majlisī: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 68/12-13 'Abbās al-Qummī: *Safīnat Al-Biḥār* 1/732, Al-Baḥrānī: *Al-Ma'ālim al-Zulfā* pg. 304, al-Ṭarīḥī: *Majma' al-Baḥrayn* 2/356 (They have falsely attributed this book to Ja'far al-Ṣādiq. His knowledge and piety refute the possibility of this.)

3 Al-Baghdādī: *Uṣūl al-Dīn* pg. 298, al-Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ: *al-Shifā* pg. 290, Ibn Taymiyyah: *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/177

4 Refer to *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 23/69, *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 4/13, *Tafsīr al-Qurṭubī* 15/91, Ibn al-Jowzī: *Zād al-Masīr* 7/67

5 There exists a defective opinion, which is attributed to al-Farrā, which states that Ibrāhīm was from the group of Muḥammad. Al-Showkānī comments, "the extent to which this opposes the context and the degree of its inaccuracy is self-evident." (*Fatḥ al-Qadīr* 4/401). Al-Alūsī says, "al-Farrā was of the opinion that 'his group' in the verse referred to our Nabī, Muḥammad ﷺ. However, the accurate meaning is that which we have pointed out (viz. it refers to Nūḥ عليه السلام). This view has been narrated from Ibn 'Abbās, Mujaḥid, Qatādah and Suddī. It is against the norm to say that a person from the former times belongs to the group of someone from the later eras. (*Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī* 23/99-100)

6 Al-Ṭabarsī: *Majma' al-Bayān* 5/67

The Word Shī'ah in the Sunnah and the Meanings Implied

The word Shī'ah appears in the Sunnah. The meaning which is implied therein is followers. This is with reference to the ḥadīth reported by Imām Aḥmad regarding the man¹ who said to Nabī ﷺ, "I believe that you were unjust!" Nabī ﷺ said regarding him,

سيكون له شيعة يتعمقون في الدين حتى يخرجوا منه...

He will have followers who will delve so deep into matters of dīn that they will (get irritated thereby and) leave the dīn...²

The same meaning is implied in the ḥadīth reported by Abū Dāwūd regarding those who do not believe in the concept of pre-destination...

وهم شيعة الدجال

They will be the followers of Dajjāl.³

Thus, the word Shī'ah in these texts means companions, followers and helpers. Further, I could not find any ḥadīth wherein the word Shī'ah was used to refer to the infamous sect, despite searching through the books of ḥadīth. The only instances where the word was used to imply them or the followers of 'Alī رضي الله عنه were in those cases where the ḥadīth was either unauthentic or fabricated. Here are a few examples:

1 He was Dhū al-Khuwayṣarah al-Tamīmī... the fountainhead of the Khawārij (Refer to *Musnad Aḥmad* 12/4).

2 *Musnad Aḥmad* 12/3-5. 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Imām Aḥmad says, "there are many authentic narrations, the content of which corroborates the message of this ḥadīth." Aḥmad Shākir said, "the isnād is authentic." (ibid) Ibn Abī 'Āṣim also narrated it in his book *al-Sunnah* (2/454).

3 *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* 5/67. Al-Mundhirī said, "Umar, the mawlā of Ghufra appears in the isnād. His narrations cannot be used as proof. There also appears an unknown person from the Anṣār therein." *Mukhtaṣar Abī Dāwūd* 7/61. Imām Aḥmad also narrates this ḥadīth (5/407).

فاستغفرت لعلی و شیعتہ

I sought forgiveness for ‘Alī and his Shī‘ah.¹

مثلى مثل شجرة انا اصلها و على فرعها...والشيعه ورقها

My example is that of a tree. I am the roots, ‘Alī is the branch... and the Shī‘ah are the leaves.²

انت و شيعتك فى الجنة

Nabī ﷺ said to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, “you and your Shī‘ah are n Jannah.”³

Some narrations suggest that there will appear a group who will claim to be the supporters of ‘Alī and they will be called ‘Rāfiḍah.⁴ Imām Ibn Abī ‘Āṣim reports four narrations concerning the Rāfiḍah.⁵ These narrations have been declared unauthentic on account of their isnāds. Al-Ṭabarānī reports (with a reliable isnād — as stated by al-Haythamī) that Nabī ﷺ said:

يا على سيكون فى امتى قوم يتحلون حب اهل البيت لهم نبي يسمون الرافضة قاتلوهم فانهم مشركون

‘O ‘Alī, there will be a group in this ummah who will claim love for the Ahl

1 Al-‘Uqaylī said, “this narration is baseless.” Al-Kinānī mentions it among the fabricated narrations (*Tanzīh al-Sharī‘ah* 1/414)

2 Ibn al-Jowzī mentions it in his book regarding fabricated narrations, *al-Mowḍū‘āt* 1/397. Al-Showkānī also mentions it in his book regarding the subject, *Al-Fawā‘id al-Majmū‘ah fī l-Aḥādīth al-Mowḍū‘ah* pg. 379.

3 Another fabricated narration. Refer to Ibn al-Jowzī: *Al-Mowḍū‘āt* 1/397, al-Dhahabī: *Mizān al-I‘tidāl* 1/421 (biography of Jamī ibn ‘Umar ibn Sawār), Al-Showkānī: *Al-Fawā‘id al-Majmū‘ah* pg. 379

4 The meaning of Rāfiḍah will be explained at a later stage.

5 Such as the ḥadīth, “celebrate o ‘Alī, for you and your Shī‘ah will be in Jannah. Listen well, among those who will claim to love you will be a group who will distance themselves from Islam. They will be called Rāfiḍah. If you meet them, then fight against them as they are polytheists.” I asked, “O Rasūlullāh, What will be their sign?” He replied, “they will neither attend Jumū‘ah ṣalāh nor any of the congregational ṣalāh and they will condemn the pious predecessors.” (*Al-Sunnah lī Ibn Abī ‘Āṣim* 2/475). This ḥadīth has also been mentioned by Al-Showkānī in *al-Aḥādīth al-Mowḍū‘ah* pg. 380-381.

al-Bayṭ. They will have a nickname, they will be called al-Rāfiḍah. Fight against them, as they are polytheists.¹

Ibn Taymiyyah pointed out the falsity of all the narrations attributed to Nabī ﷺ in which the word “Rāfiḍah” was used, on the basis of the fact that this word was only coined in the second century.² My personal opinion is that this is not sufficient reason to declare the aḥādīth to be fabrications. This is because, if the isnāds are proven to be reliable, then it will be among those narrations which inform us of future occurrences. It will be understood that Allah informed his Nabī that in future, the Rawāfiḍ will appear, just as He informed him regarding the appearance Khawārij³ — even though their inception occurred within his very lifetime.⁴

The Word Shī'ah and its Meaning in the Books of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah

The word Shī'ah appears repeatedly in the narrations and aḥādīth, which they attribute to Rasūlullāh ﷺ, 'Alī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn and the rest of the twelve Imāms⁵ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. In these aḥādīth, it is as if the word was understood to be a term used to refer to their sect, beliefs and their Imāms. It is on account of this that they deluded themselves into believing that Rasūlullāh ﷺ was the one who planted the seed of Shī'ism and watered it until it grew and ripened.⁶

1 *Majma' Al-Zawā'id* 1/22. Refer to the ḥadīth in *Al-Mu'jam al-Kabīr* of al-Ṭabarānī (12/242 number 12998). The isnād contains al-Ḥajjāj ibn Tamīm who is unreliable. Refer to *Taqrīb Al-Tahdhīb* 1/152

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/8

3 *Al-Bukhārī* and Muslim report ten aḥādīth regarding them. *Al-Bukhārī* reports three and the rest are reported by Muslim. Ibn al-Qayyim quotes all of them in *Tahdhīb al-Sunan* 7/147-153.

4 This is established from a few narrations. One such narration is the story of the man who said to Rasūlullāh ﷺ — whilst he was distributing the spoils of war, “be just, O Muḥammad!...” Refer to the complete ḥadīth in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (which is printed along with *Fatḥ al-Bārī*) 12/290 and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (with the commentary of al-Nawawī) 7/165.

5 Sunnah, according to them, refers to all that which was said by Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the twelve Imāms, as will be explained.

6 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*, under the section, “the appointment of the Imāms is done by Allah, His messenger and the Imāms (as they believe),” the author mentions thirteen chapters which contain a total of one hundred and ten aḥādīth (*Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/286-327).

In fact, they have exceeded the limit to the extent that they have even fabricated narrations to prove that the word Shī'ah (as a term used to refer to their sect) was well-known even before the era of our Nabī, Muḥammad ﷺ. Their aḥādīth contain narrations, under the explanation of the verse, “and indeed, among his kind was Ibrāhīm,”¹ which explain that Ibrāhīm عليه السلام was from the Shī'ah of 'Alī رضي الله عنه.² Amazingly, this is not where their claims end. Rather, they go on to claim that Allah took a covenant and a pledge from the ambiyā' that they should attest to the Wilāyah of 'Alī رضي الله عنه,³ and that the Wilāyah of 'Alī was revealed in all the scriptures of the ambiyā'.⁴ There are other claims of this nature as well, which will be explained upon under the section, “Development of Shī'ism”.

The Word Shī'ah in the Light of Islamic History

Records of the initial periods of Islamic history refer to the word Shī'ah in no other sense besides its literal meaning, i.e. helping and following. We find this word being used in the document of the arbitration between 'Alī and Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنهما. It is used therein for the supporters of both these luminaries and it is not confined to the supporters of 'Alī رضي الله عنه. Below is an excerpt from this document:

هذا ما تقاضى عليه على بن ابي طالب و معاوية بن ابي سفيان و شيعتهما... (و منها): وان عليا و شيعته رضوا بعبد الله بن قيس و رضى معاوية و شيعته بعمر بن العاص... (و منها) فاذا توفي احد الحكمين فلشيعته و انصاره ان يختاروا مكانه (و منها) وان مات احد الاميرين قبل انقضاء الاجل المحدود في هذه القضية فلشيعته ان يختاروا مكانه رجلا يرضون عدله

This is the settlement upon which 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān and their followers (Shī'ah) have agreed upon... (amongst which is that) 'Alī and his followers (Shī'ah) have chosen 'Abd Allāh ibn Qays, whilst Mu'āwiyah and his supporters (Shī'ah) have chosen 'Amr ibn al-Āṣ... If any of these intermediaries happen to pass away, then the respective group of

1 Sūrah al-ṣāffāt: 83

2 The references regarding this have already been cited.

3 Al-Baḥrānī: *Tafsīr al-Burhān* 1/26

4 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/437

supporters (Shī'ah) and helpers will have the right to replace him with a person of their choice... If one of the leaders passes away before the fixed time in this matter, then his supporters (Shī'ah) will have the right to replace him with one whose justice pleases them.¹

Ḥakīm ibn Aflah رحمته الله said:

لانى نهيتها (يعنى عائشة رضى الله عنها) ان تقول فى هتين الشيعتين شيئاً

It is because I prohibited her ('Ā'ishah رحمته الله) from saying anything regarding these two groups (Shī'ah).²

Ibn Taymiyyah quoted this text and used it as proof from the historical perspective that the word Shī'ah was not confined in that era to 'Alī رحمته الله. Another historical report which proves the argument is the incident when Mu'āwiyah رحمته الله sent Busr ibn Arţāt towards Yemen saying:

امض حتى تاتى صنعاء فان لنا بها شيعة

Carry on until you reach Ṣan'ā, as we have supporters (Shī'ah) there.³

Thus, it has been proven that until that era, the word Shī'ah was not confined to 'Alī رحمته الله. It seems as if the claimants of Shī'ism did not physically gather and adopt this name formally, to distinguish themselves from the rest until the martyrdom of Ḥusayn رحمته الله. Al-Mus'ūdī says:

وفى سنة خمس وستين تحركت الشيعة فى الكوفة وتكونت حركة التوابين ثم حركة المحتار (الكيسانية) و بدئت الشيعة تتكون و تضع اصول مذهبها... و اخذت تتميز بهذا الاسم

1 Al-Dīnwarī: *Al-Akhhbār al-Ṭiwāl* pg. 194-196. Refer to *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 5/53-54, Muḥammad Ḥamīd Allah: *Majmū'at al-Wathā'iq al-Siyāsiyyah* pg. 281-282

2 This is part of a lengthy ḥadīth which appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* under the chapter regarding all the matters concerning ṣalāh of the night and the one who sleeps through it or is ill (2/168, 170).

3 *Tārīkh al-Ya'qūbī* 2/197

In the year 65 (A.H) the Shī'ah began mobilising in Kūfah¹ and the movement of the *Towwābūn* (repentant ones) took shape. The same was the case with the movement of al-Mukhtār (al-Kaysāniyyah). The Shī'ah also started formalising themselves, laying the foundations and principles of their madh-hab... and they began distinguishing themselves from others by this name.

From the above, it has become clear that that the word “Shī'ah” was used to refer to any group of people who rallied behind their leader. Some groups (Shī'ah) wish to ignore these historic facts and claim that “they were the first to be called Shī'ah in this ummah.”² They ignore the fact that Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه used the word Shī'ah to refer to his followers. Historic records prove that the word Shī'ah was not specific to the followers of 'Alī رضي الله عنه until the martyrdom of 'Alī رضي الله عنه³ — as stated by some, or the martyrdom of Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه⁴ — as stated by others.

The Technical Meaning of the Word Shī'ah

a. As Defined by the Books of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah

The First Definition

Al-Qummī⁵ (d. 301 A.H) defines the word Shī'ah in the following words:

هم شيعة علي بن أبي طالب

They are the Shī'ah of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.⁶

1 *Murūj al-Madh-hab* 3/100

2 Al-Qummī: *Al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq* pg. 15, al-Nawbakhtī: *Firaq al-Shī'ah* pg. 18

3 Muḥammad Abū Zahrah: *Al-Mīrāth 'ind al-Ja'fariyyah* pg. 22

4 'Alī Sāmī al-Nashshār: *Nash'at al-Fikr al-Falsafi* 2/35

5 Sa'd ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Qummī. He is a great and very knowledgeable scholar according to the Shī'ah. He authored many books and he is considered reliable by them. Among his books are *al-Ḍiyā fī l-Imāmah* and *Maqālāt al-Imāmiyyah*. He died in the year 301 A.H. or 299 A.H. Refer to al-Ṭūsī: *Al-fahrist* pg. 105, al-Ardabīlī: *Jāmī' al-Ruwāt* 1/355.

6 *Al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq* pg. 3

الشيعه هم فرقة على بن ابي طالب المسلمون شيعة على في زمان النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم و بعده
معروفون بانقطاعهم اليه والقول بامامته

The Shī'ah are the group of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, who are Muslims. The Shī'ah of 'Alī were known for confining themselves to him and claiming his Imāmah during the lifetime of Nabī ﷺ and even after his demise.¹

Al-Nawbakhtī² agrees with this definition to the extent that he repeats it using the exact same words.³

An Analysis of the First Definition

This is the definition of the word Shī'ah in the most important and the earliest book of the Shī'ah regarding sects. This definition does not indicate towards any core beliefs and principles of the Shī'ah, such as the belief that 'Alī and his sons ﷺ were divinely appointed. (The only mention of their beliefs is the words “the Imāmah of 'Alī”. However, there is no mention of divine appointment or any of his successors.)

A definition which omits the principles laid down by latter day Shī'ah is among the correct definitions of the Shī'ah of 'Alī or the real Shī'ah. It expels all the claims of the Shī'ah from the boundaries of Shī'ism. These claims are such that the Ahl al-Bayt were completely unaware of them and they had no relation to that which they said. However, the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah do not accept this as the correct definition of Shī'ism, even though al-Qummī and al-Nawbakhtī were of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah.

1 *Al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq* pg. 15

2 Ḥasan ibn Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī (Abū Muḥammad, the theologian and philosopher). Al-Ṭūsī said, “he was an Imām who had correct beliefs. He authored many books including *Kitāb al-Ārā wa l-Diyānāt*.” He died after the year 300 A.H refer to al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fahrist* (pg. 75), Al-Ardabīlī: *Jāmi' al-Ruwāt* (1/228), Ibn al-Nadīm: *Al-Fahrist* (pg. 177), Al-Qummī: *Al-Kunnā wa l-Alqāb* (1/148), Mu'jam al-Mu'allifin (3/298), al-Dhahabī: *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* (15/327)

3 *Firaq al-Shī'ah* pg. 2, 17

This definition claims that the Shī'ah of 'Alī were present during the era of Nabī ﷺ. This is a claim that cannot be substantiated by means of any kind of proof, be it the Qur'ān, Sunnah or even authentic history. Rather, the opposite can be found in the Qur'ān, as Allah ﷻ says:

إِنَّ الدِّينَ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ الْإِسْلَامُ

Indeed, the religion in the sight of Allah is Islam.¹

Thus, we do not see any mention of Shī'ism or any other religion/sect. The Ṣaḥābah were all one group, sect and the Shī'ah during the era of Nabī ﷺ. Their support and allegiance was Rasūlullāh ﷺ alone.

The Second Definition

The grand Shī'ī scholar of his era, al-Mufīd, states that the word Shī'ah refers to:

اتباع أمير المؤمنين صلوات الله عليه على سبيل الولاء والاعتقاد لامامته بعد الرسول صلوات الله عليه
واله بلا فصل و نفى الامامة عمن تقدم في مقام الخلافة و جعله في الاعتقاد متبوعا لهم غير تابع لاحد
منهم على وجه الاقتداء

The followers of Amīr al-Mu'minīn (may the salutations of Allah be upon him), who take him to be their guardian and they believe in his Imāmah after Rasūlullāh ﷺ without anyone else in between. Also, it demands that Imāmah should be negated from all those before him who were khulafā before him and to believe that they followed him whereas he did not take anyone as his leader.²

Thereafter, he mentions that this definition includes the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah and Jārūdī Shī'ah. As for the rest of the groups of the Zaydiyyah, they are not part of the Shī'ah, and the term Shī'ah does not include them.³

1 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 19

2 Awā'il al-Maqālāt pg 39

3 Awā'il al-Maqālāt pg 39

An Analysis of the Second Definition

We do not see in this definition offered by al-Mufīd, any mention of believing that the son of ‘Alī is to be taken as an Imām. This is despite the fact that the one who disbelieves in this is not considered a Shī‘ī according to them. The definition also omits many fundamental aspects of Shī‘ism, upon which the cult is based. These concepts include divine appointment, infallibility etc., which are fundamental principles of the Imāmiyyah.

It should also be noticed that he explicitly excluded the moderate sect of the Zaydiyyah from his definition of Shī‘ah, and he explains that it only includes the extremist Jārūdīs.¹ Furthermore, he has opened the door to include all the extremist Shī‘ah under the definition of Shī‘ism. As for his claim, “to believe that they followed him whereas he did not take anyone as his leader,” this is an indication towards one of the basic and primary beliefs of the Shī‘ah, i.e. *Taqiyyah* (dissimulation). According to them, ‘Alī was outwardly a follower of the Khulafā’, but secretly, he was their leader. Thus, his obedience to them — according to al-Mufīd and his Shī‘ah — was not carried out with sincerity. Instead, it was *taqiyyah*. He did not believe that they were his leaders, he simply towed the line to please them.

1 A sect from the Zaydiyyah, who are affiliated with Abū al-Jārūd Ziyād ibn al-Mundhir al-Hamdānī al-Kūfī, who was blind. Abū Ḥātim said regarding him. He was a Rāfiḍī who would fabricate aḥādīth in criticism of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. Among the statements of the Jārūdiyyah is, “Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم personally appointed ‘Alī عليه السلام by indicating towards him and describing him. He did not take his name and specify him. The ummah, by placing the matter in the hands of others have gone astray and committed kufr.” For more details regarding Abū al-Jārūd and the Jārūdiyyah, refer to *Rijāl al-Kashshī* (pg. 151, 229, 230), it contains six narrations, among which there are narrations which imply that he was a liar and a disbeliever. Despite this, their scholar, al-Mufīd includes him among the Shī‘ah. This is because, according to his definition, Shī‘ism is the name of this type of extremism. Also refer to Al-Ṭūsī: *Al-Fahrist* (pg. 192), Al-Ardabīlī: *Jāmi‘ al-Ruwāt* (1/339), Al-Qummī: *al-Kunnā wa l-Alqāb* (1/30), Ibn Ḥajar: *Tahdhīb Al-Tahdhīb* (3/386), al-Qummī: *Al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq* (pg. 18), al-Nawbakhtī: *Firaq al-Shī‘ah* (pg. 21), Mishwān: *Al-Ḥūr al-‘Ayn* (pg. 165), Al-Maqrīzī: *Al-Khuṭaṭ* (2/352), Al-Shahrastānī: *Al-Milāl wa l-Niḥāl* (1/159), Al-Milṭī: *Al-Tanbīh wa l-Radd* (pg. 23), Aḥmad ibn al-Murtaḍā: *Al-Munyah wa l-Amal* (pg. 20, 90), Al-Baghdādī: *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* (pg. 30), Al-Rāzī: *Muḥaṣṣal Afkār al-Mutaqaddimīn wa l-Muta’akhhirīn* (pg. 247), Al-Ash‘arī: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* (1/140).

His statement, “... they believe in the Imāmah of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ after Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ without anyone else in between,” is based upon the Shī‘ī propaganda that the khilāfah of the first three Khulafā’ was invalid. Al-Mufīd explains this statement in detail in another of his writings.¹ He says:

و كانت امامة امير المؤمنين بعد النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم ثلاثون سنة منها اربع وعرون سنة وستة اشهر ممنوعا من التصرف في احكامها مستعملا للتقية و المداراة و منها خمس سنين و ستة اشهر ممتحنا بجهاد المنافقين من الناكثين و القاسطين و المارقين و مضطهدا بقتن الضالين كما كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ثلاث عشر كذا سنة من نبوته ممنوعا من احكامها خائفا و محبوسا و هاربا و مطرودا لا يتمكن من جهاد الكافرين و لا يستطيع دفعا عن المؤمنين ثم هاجر و اقام بعد الهجرة عشر سنين مجاهدا للمشركين ممتحنا بالمنافقين الى ان قبضه الله جل اسمه اليه و اسكنه جنات النعيم

The Imāmah of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn after the demise of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ lasted for a period of thirty years. Twenty four years and six months of this period were spent in Taqiyyah and towing the line, as he was stopped from getting involved in its affairs. The next five years and six months were spent in doing jihād against the hypocrites from the *Nākithīn*, *Qāsiṭīn* and *Māriqīn*² as well as dealing with the trials created by the deviates. This was the same as the condition of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, who was not allowed to implement his laws for thirteen years of his nubuwwah. He was in the state of fear, restricted, a fugitive and he was chased away in these years. He could not fight against the disbelievers or protect the Muslims. Thereafter, he migrated and he spent the remaining ten years fighting against the polytheists and he was tested with the hypocrites until Allah, whose name is glorified, repossessed his soul and granted him residence in the bountiful gardens.³

1 *Kitāb Al-Irshād*, one of the most reliable books according to the Twelvers. The forward of *Al-Irshād* (pg. 70) states: “The scholars of the Imāmiyyah, former as well as latter day scholars, relied upon it. They have considered it among the most important books on the subject and they have paid great attention to it.” To learn more about their reliance upon this book, refer to *Biḥār al-Anwār* (1/27).

2 The book *Ma‘ānī al-Akhhbār* by their scholar Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī explains: “*Nākithīn* refers to those who pledged allegiance to him in Madīnah and thereafter broke their pledge in Baṣrah. *Qāsiṭīn* refers to Mu‘āwiyah and his companions from Shām, and *Māriqīn* refers to the people of Nahrawān.” (*Ma‘ānī al-Akhhbār* pg. 204)

3 *Al-Irshād* pg. 12

Thus, according to al-Mufīd, the term Shī'ah only refers to those who believe that the khilāfah of 'Alī رضي الله عنه started with the demise of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and ended with his death.¹ The khilāfah of the first three khulafā', according to him, was invalid. Hence, according to him, the word Shī'ah could only be used to refer to three people after the demise of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. The rest of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, according to the Shī'ah, were disbelievers just like the polytheists who lived in the era of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم. The governance was one of kufr. Thus, they believe that 'Alī lived amongst them practising dissimulation and behaving like a hypocrite.² Is it possible for anyone to insult 'Alī رضي الله عنه, the Ṣaḥābah and Islam in a manner worse than this?

The Third Definition of the Word Shī'ah

Since al-Mufīd did not mention, in his definition of the word Shī'ah, the aspect of divine appointment and the bequest, we find that their scholar al-Ṭūsī³ bailed them out and covered up in this aspect by basing Shī'ism upon the belief that 'Alī رضي الله عنه became the Imām of the Muslims upon the bequest of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and the will of Allah.⁴ Hence, al-Ṭūsī at this point establishes that believing that 'Alī رضي الله عنه was appointed by Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم and Allah as the khalīfah is a fundamental belief of Shī'ism. It is for this reason that he excludes the Zaydiyyah

1 Their scholar 'Abd Allāh Shibr affirms this meaning in his definition of Shī'ism. He says: "Know well that the word Shī'ah is used to refer to those who believe that the khilāfah of 'Alī رضي الله عنه began immediately after the death of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم without anyone else in-between." (*Haq al-Yaqīn* 1/195)

2 The proofs regarding this will appear under the discussion regarding the law of the one who rejects the Imāmah of the twelve Imāms.

3 Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī al-Ṭūsī. He is regarded by them to be Shaykh al-Imāmiyyah and *Ra'īs al-Ṭā'ifah* (leader of the group). He is the author of two of their four canonical works (which hold a similar position in their circles like that of the six books of ḥadīth according to the Ahl al-Sunnah). These books are *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* and *Al-Istibṣār*. He was born in the year 385 A.H and died in the year 460 A.H. Refer to his autobiography in al-Fahrist pg. 88-190, Al-Baḥrānī: *Lu'lu'at al-Baḥrayn* pg. 293-304, Al-Qummī: *Al-Kunnā wa l-Alqāb* 2/357, and *Lisān al-Mizān* of Ibn Ḥajar 5/135

4 *Talkhīs al-Shāfi* 2/56

Sulaymāniyyah¹, from the sects of Shī'ah as they believe that the Imām is not divinely appointed.

Their beliefs regarding Imāmah are as follows: "Imāmah is a position that is decided through mutual consultation. It can be enacted by the decision of two Muslims, if they are among the most virtuous ones. It is also valid in the case when the person appointed to the post is not the most virtuous person of his era." The Khilāfah of Abū Bakr and 'Umar² (رضي الله عنه) is accepted by them. Hence, they were not only excluded from the Shī'ī cult, but instead they were even labelled as "Nawāṣib"³. As if that was not enough, it was stated in *Rijāl al-Kashshī* that the Zaydiyyah are worse than the Nawāṣib.⁴ This judgement was passed by the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah regarding all the sects of the Zaydiyyah who agree with this view of the Sulaymāniyyah such as the Ṣālihiyyah and the Batriyyah.⁵

1 A sect of the Zaydiyyah who are affiliated with Sulaymān ibn Jarīr al-Zaydī. They are named Sulaymāniyyah by many of those who have authored regarding the subject of sects. Refer to *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/143, *I'tiqād Firaq al-Muslimīn* pg. 78, *Al-Milal wa l-Niḥal* 1/159, *Al-Tabṣīr fī l-Dīn* pg. 17.

Some of the authors on the subject of sects have named them the Jarīriyyah. (*al-Ḥurr al-'Ayn* pg. 156, *Al-Maqrīzī: Al-Khuṭaṭ* 2/352) the author of *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* clearly mentions that they are referred to as the Sulaymāniyyah or Jarīriyyah (*Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg. 32). The author of *Al-Munyah wa l-Amal* at times refers to them as Sulaymāniyyah (pg. 90) and at times he refers to them as Jarīriyyah (pg. 90).

2 Al-Ash'arī: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/143

3 Refer to al-Ṭūsī: *Al-Tahdhīb* 1/364, Al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī: *Al-Wasā'il* 4/288. Nawāṣib are those who consider hatred for 'Alī (رضي الله عنه) to be part of their religion. Ibn Manẓūr: *Lisān al-'Arab* 1/762. However, the Rāfiḍah have a different definition of the word, as you have seen. They go to the extent of classifying all those who do not hate Abū Bakr and 'Umar (رضي الله عنه) as Nawāṣib. (*Majmū' Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 5/ 112). In fact, even the one who says that Abū Bakr was more virtuous than 'Alī is considered by them to be from the Nawāṣib. Refer to Ibn Idrīs: *Al-Sarā'ir* pg. 471, Al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī: *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 6/341-342.

4 Refer to *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 459

5 Ṣālihiyyah are the followers of Ḥasan ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn Ḥayy. Batriyyah are the followers of Kathīr al-Nawā al-Abtar. Both sects have the same view as the Sulaymāniyyah regarding Imāmiyyah. Al-Shahrastānī considers both of them to be one sect, as their views are the same. Al-Ash'arī only mentioned the Batriyyah. He says that they do not believe in reincarnation and they believe that the Imāmah of 'Alī (رضي الله عنه) started only after allegiance was pledged to him. (al-Ash'arī: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/144, Al-Shahrastānī: *Al-Milal wa l-Niḥal* 1/ 161)

Some of their contemporary scholars hold the same view as al-Ṭūsī. They only consider those who believe that ‘Alī’s ﷺ appointment to the post of Imāmah was divine to be Shī‘ah. They assert that the word Shī‘ah “is the official title of those who believe that ‘Alī was appointed as the khalīfah by Nabī ﷺ.”¹

It is important to take note that the idea of divine appointment was something that both former and latter day Shī‘ī scholars paid special attention to. Thus, we find that their scholar, al-Kulaynī penned down thirteen chapters (in which he quoted one hundred and nine narrations²) in his book *al-Kāfī* regarding this matter. In this day and age, one of the Rāfiḍī scholars authored a book of sixteen volumes regarding one of the narrations that is used by them to prove that the appointment of ‘Alī ﷺ was divine. This ḥadīth is the ḥadīth of al-Ghadīr³, so he named his book *al-Ghadīr*.⁴

We are not surprised by the fact they the Shī‘ah have taken the belief in the divine appointment of ‘Alī ﷺ to be a fundamental and core belief of Shī‘ism. However, what does surprise us is the extent and degree to which they go in proving all those beliefs which are taken to be far-fetched by majority of the Muslims. You will find that they consider all these types of beliefs to be the foundations and core beliefs of Shī‘ism, yet when their scholars define Shī‘ism, they do not even hint towards these beliefs — despite the fact that they believe Shī‘ism cannot be adopted without subscribing to those beliefs, and there is no Shī‘ism without them.

Among these beliefs is the belief of *Raj‘ah* (reincarnation). They have it recorded in there narrations that, “the one who does not belief in our Raj‘ah is not among

1 Muḥammad Jawād Mughniyah: *Al-Shī‘ah fī l-Mīzān* pg. 15

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/286-328

3 Details regarding this as well as an analysis will appear under the section wherein the proofs of the Shī‘ah regarding Imāmah are mentioned.

4 *Kitāb al-Ghadīr* by their scholar ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Amīnī al-Najafī. It is filled with lies, calamities and blatant kufr. Refer to *Mas‘alat al-Taqrīb Bayn al-Sunnah wa l-Shī‘ah* by the same author, page 66.

us.”¹ Despite this, one will never find this in their definition of Shī‘ism. The same is the condition of the belief in infallibility, belief in the Imāmah of the progeny of ‘Alī عليه السلام, etc. This extremism is also found in certain matters of jurisprudence and subsidiary matters such as *mut‘ah* (temporary marriage). They say, “the one who does not believe in the permissibility of our *mut‘ah* is not from us.”² Therefore, it can be concluded that they have no clarity and consistency in their religion.

Other Definitions of the Word Shī‘ah

There are other definitions of the word Shī‘ah in the books of former as well as latter day Shī‘ī scholars, which do not differ with that which has been mentioned thus far.³ Along with this, there are other definitions which were formed in a very different way. They do not mention any of their beliefs therein. As an example, their scholar, Al-Najāshī⁴ states:

الشيعية الذين اذا اختلف الناس عن رسول الله اخذوا بقول علي واذا اختلف الناس عن علي اخذوا بقول
جعفر بن محمد

The Shī‘ah are those who accept the statement of ‘Alī when the people differed regarding Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, and they accept the statement of Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad when people differed regarding ‘Alī.⁵

1 Ibn Bābawayh: *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* 3/291, Al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī: *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 7/438, *Tafsīr al-ṣāfi* 1/347, Al-Majlisī: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 53/92

2 Ibid

3 Among these definitions are definitions which base Shī‘ism upon following ‘Alī عليه السلام and granting him precedence over others in Imāmah. Refer to *Sharḥ al-Lum‘ah* 2/228. Other definitions add on that it is necessary to believe that he was appointed as Imām by Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and Allah in clear terms as the Imāmiyyah believe, and in unclear terms as the Jārūdiyyah believe. Mowsū‘at al-Atbāt al-Muqaddasah pg. 91, ‘An Hawiyyat al-Tashayyu’ pg. 12.

4 Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad ibn al-‘Abbās al-Najāshī. He authored the book *Kitāb al-Rijāl*, which is relied upon by the scholars of the Imāmiyyah. He died in the year 450 A.H. Refer to al-Ardabīlī: *Jāmi‘ al-Ruwāt* 1/54, Al-Qummī: *Al-Kunnā* 3/199.

5 *Rijāl al-Najāshī* pg. 9

What happens when there are differences in the statements attributed to Ja'far ibn Muḥammad? At this point, who do they follow? We do not find the answer to that in the definition. Except if the definition implies that matters are concluded by the statements of Ja'far ibn Muḥammad and there are no differences among those who narrate from him. However, this implication cannot be established, as reality as well as the narrations from Ja'far — even in the books of the Shī'ah — belie it. The other possibility is that this statement was made within the lifetime of Ja'far ibn Muḥammad, due to which his decision was final, and al-Najāshī merely narrated it. Whatever the case may be, it neither indicates towards the Imāms before Ja'far, nor to those after him.

Furthermore, this definition contradicts the temperament of Islam. He says that when there are differences in the narrations from Rasūlullāh ﷺ, then instead of adopting the correct and accepted principles and procedures in order to establish that which is accurate, we should blindly accept the view of 'Alī رضي الله عنه. The same is said as far as taking the statement of Ja'far when there are differences concerning the sayings of 'Alī رضي الله عنه. Furthermore, we would like to ask, how is it that there will be no differences regarding the sayings of Ja'far, whereas there are differences regarding the sayings of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and 'Alī رضي الله عنه? Was he greater than them?

The books of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah contain a few more definitions of the word Shī'ism. These definitions imply that Tashayyu' and Shī'ism are synonymous to piety, uprightness and steadfastness. Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ṣādiq says:

ما شيعتنا الا من اتقى الله و اطاعه و ما كانوا يعرفون الا بالتواضع و التخشع و الامانة¹

Our Shī'ah are only those who fear Allah and obey Him. They would be recognised by their humility, submissiveness and trustworthiness.¹

انما شيعة علي من غف بطنه و فرجه و اشتد جهاده و عمل لخالقه و رجا ثوابه و خاف عقابه فاذا رتيت اولاءك فاولائك شيعة جعفر

1 *Safīnat Al-Biḥār* 1/ 733

The Shī'ah of 'Alī are only those whose bellies and private parts are guarded, they exert themselves, work to please their creator alone, anticipate His reward and fear His punishment. When you see these people, then know that they are the real Shī'ah of Ja'far.¹

Abū Ja'far al-Bāqir said:

لا تذهب بكم المذاهب فوالله ما شيعتنا الا من اطاع الله عز و خل

The different sects should not sweep you away. By the oath of Allah, our Shī'ah are only those who obey Allah the exalted and glorified.²

b. The Definition of the Word Shī'ah from the Books of the Ismā'īlī

Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (who was among the most prominent propagators of Ismā'īlism³) says in his book *al-Zīnah*:

الشيعة لقب لقوم قد افوا امير المؤمنين على بن ابي طالب صلوات الله عليه في حياة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وعرفوا به مثل سلمان الفارسي و ابي ذر الغفاري والمقداد بن اسود و عمار بن ياسر و كان يقال لهم شيعة على و اصحاب على... ثم لزم هذا اللقب كل من قال بتفضيله بعده الى يومنا و تشبعت

1 Op. cit. 1/732

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/73, Shaykh Mūsā Jār Allāh quotes at the end of *al-Washī'ah* (pg 230) similar texts from the books of the Shī'ah. Thereafter he explains, "these Shī'ah were the Shī'ah of 'Alī. They were known for their scrupulousness, exertion, staying away from minor sins and hatred. They were loved by the former part of the ummah. The religion of these Shī'ah was *taqwā* (piety) and not Taqiyyah. The religion of these Shī'ah was loyalty to Allah, the truth, His Nabī, his Ahl al-Bayt, his Ṣaḥābah and the remainder of the believers. As for these ones, whose religion centres around Taqiyyah, hypocrisy, hatred for the Ṣaḥābah as well as some of the Ahl al-Bayt, and extremism with regards to the others; they are not part of the Shī'ah, as testified to by those who the Shī'ah take as their imāms as well as their books. This is why Imām Zayd named them Rāfiḍah instead of Shī'ah."

3 Abū Ḥātim Aḥmad ibn Ḥamdān ibn Aḥmad al-Rāzī. Among his books are *A'lām al-Nubuwwah*, *Al-Zīnah*, etc. He died in the year 322 A.H. Refer to Ibn Ḥajar: *Lisān al-Mizān* 1/164, *A'lām al-Ismā'īliyyah* pg. 97 for more details regarding him.

من هذه الفرقة فرق كثيرة سميت باسماء متفرقة و القاب شتى مثل الرافضة والزيدية والكيسانية وغير ذلك من الالقاب وهم كلهم داخلون في جملة هذا اللقب الواحد الذى يسمى الشيعة على تباينهم فى المذاهب و تفرقهم فى الاراء

Shī'ah is the title of the group who befriended 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام during the lifetime of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and they were known for this. They were Salmān al-Fārsī, Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī, Miqdād ibn al-Aswad and 'Ammār ibn Yāsir. They were referred to as the Shī'ah of 'Alī and the companions of 'Alī... Later, this title became attached to all those who believed in his superiority after him,¹ up until this day. Many sub groups emerged from this group, all of whom adopted different titles such as Rāfiḍah, Zaydiyyah, Kasāniyyah, etc. All of these groups are included in this one title, viz. Shī'ah, even though there sects and beliefs are different.²

It should be noted that in this definition, the author claims that the word Shī'ah was used to refer to a specific group of people in the very lifetime of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. This cannot be established historically. The only claimants of this are the Shī'ah, whose object is to somehow prove their madh-hab and its validity. We have peeked into the matter under the discussion of the development of Shī'ism. Another noteworthy claim is that he believes that the basis of the relationship between those Ṣaḥābah and 'Alī عليه السلام was friendship. He did not claim — as others have done — that it was on account of his divine appointment (to the post of Imāmah) from Allah and his Rasūl, as is believed by the Shī'ah.

1 i.e. superiority of 'Alī عليه السلام over all the Ṣaḥābah after Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. It is also possible that this means he is the greatest person after Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, which would mean that he is greater than the ambiyā'. In this way the extremist Rawāfiḍ as well as others would be included as well. However, the meaning that seems most likely is that it refers to all those who consider 'Alī عليه السلام to be the greatest of all people from the moment Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم passed away until this day. This seems to be the most accurate interpretation.

2 Al-Zīnah pg. 259 (Inside the book *Al-Ghulūw wa l-Firaq al-Ghāliyah*).

c. The Definition of the Word Shī'ah from Other Sources

The Definition of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī

Perhaps the first person to define Shī'ism from the authors of books on sects (besides the Shī'ī authors) was Imām al-Ash'arī¹. He states:

انما قيل لهم الشيعة لانهم شايعوا عليا رضوان الله عليه و يقدمونه على سائر اصحاب رسول الله صلى
الله عليه و سلم

They were only referred to as Shī'ah because they supported 'Alī عليه السلام and granted him precedence over all the other Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم.²

An Analysis of the Definition

This definition fits perfectly upon the Mufaḍḍilah sect of the Shī'ah (those who grant 'Alī precedence over Abū Bakr, 'Umar and the rest of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم). However, the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah do not accept that merely believing that he was superior to everyone else is enough to be called a Shī'ī. It is incumbent, according to them, to believe that he was divinely appointed as the khalīfah... it began as soon as Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم passed away... it is for this very reason that al-Ṭūsī and al-Mufīd excluded some of the Zaydiyyah from the boundaries of Shī'ism (as was explained). It could be correct to say that the definition of al-Ash'arī includes all or most of the sects of the Shī'ah, without confining it to those who believe in divine appointment as assumed by the Rawāfiḍ.

1 Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Ismā'īl ibn Abī Shibr. He was from the progeny of the great Ṣaḥābī of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, Abū Mūsā al-Ash'arī عليه السلام. He was born in the year 260/270 A.H and he passed away in the year 324 A.H in Baghdad. He was unparalleled in the science of polemics and beliefs, to the extent that the Ahl al-Sunnah have accepted him as an imām in this field. "Abū al-Ḥasan was extremely intelligent, he was an ocean of knowledge and he accomplished many great tasks. He authored many books which reflect the vastness of his knowledge." For more details refer to al-Dhahabī: *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 15/85-90.

2 *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/65

The Definition of Ibn Ḥazm

Among the most precise definitions of the word Shī'ah (according to some) is the definition of Ibn Ḥazm.¹ He states:

و من وافق الشيعة في ان عليا رضى الله عنه افضل الناس بعد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم و احقهم
بالامامة و ولده من بعده فهو شيعي و ان خالفهم فيما عدا ذلك مما اختلف فيه المسلمون فان خالفهم
فيما ذكرنا فليس شيعيا

Whoever agrees with the Shī'ah in accepting that 'Alī was the most virtuous person after Rasūlullāh ﷺ and he was most deserving of the position of Imāmah and the same applies to his progeny after him, then he is a Shī'ī, even if he disagrees with them in other matters regarding which the Muslims have had difference of opinion. If he opposes them regarding that which we have mentioned, then he will not be a Shī'ī.²

This definition was accepted by one of the Rawāfiḍ as the preferred definition, discarding that which his cohorts have stated. He considered it the most precise definition of the word Shī'ah. He explains the reason behind this choice of his saying, “from the reasons which impelled us to grant preference to the definition of Ibn Ḥazm is that accepting the superiority of Imām 'Alī over the rest of the people after Rasūlullāh ﷺ, accepting that he was the Imām and Khalīfah after Rasūlullāh ﷺ and believing that the same applies to his progeny is the foundation and core of Shī'ism.”³

However, if anyone reads the statements of the Shī'ah as far as their beliefs are concerned, such as Imāmah, 'ismah (infallibility), Taqiyyah, etc., he will find that they exaggerate the importance of each of their beliefs, to the extent that they declare adherence to these beliefs a pre-requisite for being included among the

1 Abū Muḥammad 'Alī ibn Sa'īd ibn Ḥazm al-Zāhirī. He was born in the year 383/4 A.H in Cordoba and he passed away in the year 456 A.H in Andalus (Spain).

2 Al-Fiṣal 2/107

3 'Abd Allāh Fayyāḍ: *Tārīkh al-Imāmiyyah* pg. 33

Shī'ah. This has already been explained above. Perhaps al-Shahrastānī realised this when he defined for us the word Shī'ah. His definition is the most comprehensive and inclusive definition with regards to the principles of the Shī'ah.

The Definition of al-Shahrastānī

Al-Shahrastānī¹ says:

الشبيعة هم الذين شايعوا عليا رضى الله عنه على الخصوص و قالوا بامامته و خلافته نصا و وصية اما جلجا و اما خفيا و اعتقدوا ان الامامة لا تخرج من اولاده و ان خرجت فبظلم يكون من غيره او بتقية من عنده و قالوا ليست الامامة قضية مصلحة تناط باختيار العامة و ينتصب الامام بنصيبهم بل هي قضية اصولية و هي ركن الدين لا يجوز للرسل اغفاله و اهماله و لا تفويضه الى العامة و ارساله

و يجمعهم القول بوجوب التعيين و التنصيب و ثبوت عصمة الانبياء و الائمة و جوبا عن الكبائر و الصغائر و القول بالتولى و التبرى قولاً و فعلاً و عقداً الا في حال التقية و يخالفهم بعض الزيدية في ذلك.

The Shī'ah are those who support 'Alī عليه السلام exclusively. They believe that he was divinely appointed through the bequest of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم (either directly or indirectly) as the Imām and Khalīfah. They also believe that Imāmah is confined to his progeny. If anyone else holds the position, he does so through oppression or on account of the Imām adopting Taqiyyah. They claim that Imāmah is not just a governmental position which can be attained by selection or appointment by the public. Instead, Imāmah is a pivotal matter and it is the basis of religion. The messenger is not allowed to be negligent regarding it, overlook it, hand it over to the masses or leave it suspended.

The common factor between them is the belief in the theory that divine appointment took place, the *ambiyā'* and the Imāms were divinely

1 Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Karīm ibn Aḥmad Abū al-Faṭḥ, commonly referred to as al-Shahrastānī. Imām al-Subkī says: "He was an outstanding Imām in the fields of Islamic philosophy and logic. He had expertise in jurisprudence, principles and Islamic philosophy. Among his writings are *Al-Milal wa l-Nihāl*, *Nihāyat al-Iqdām*, etc." He was born in the year 467 or 479 A.H. and he passed away in the year 548 A.H. Refer to *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyyah* 6/128-130, *Mir'āt al-Jinān* 3/284-290

protected from all major and minor sins and the belief that it is incumbent to practice *Tawallī* (support for ‘Alī عليه السلام and those who they assume are his supporters) and *Tabarrī* (disassociate from all those who they falsely accuse of being the haters of ‘Alī عليه السلام) in word, practice and in dealings, except under the pretence of Taqiyyah. Some of the Zaydiyyah disagree with them.¹

This definition has made it clear that all the sects of the Shī‘ah, besides some of the Zaydiyyah, believe in the incumbency of believing in Imāmah, ‘ismah, Taqiyyah. The Imāmiyyah, as will be seen, believe in a few more concepts such as Ghaybah, Raj‘ah, Badā, etc. Similarly, it is important to note that Imām Zayd and his followers do not believe in the infallibility of the Imāms. In addition, they do not prevent the ummah from appointing an Imām for themselves. This is why Imām Zayd considers it permissible for a less virtuous person to be the Imām in the presence of those who surpass him in virtue. They do not believe in Taqiyyah. It seems as if al-Shahrastānī was indicating towards this when he said, “some of the Zaydiyyah disagree with them.” However, there are some of the Zaydiyyah who believe that Fāṭimah, ‘Alī and Ḥusayn² عليه السلام were infallible. Others believe that three Imāms (‘Alī, and his two sons عليه السلام³) were divinely appointed. These beliefs are against the beliefs of the majority.⁴

d. The Most Appropriate Definition

I believe that Shī‘ism cannot be defined without paying due attention to the stages of their metamorphosis, especially their ever-changing stances on the subject of beliefs. Shī‘ī beliefs are constantly changed and modified. This is why the Shī‘ah of the first century have almost nothing in common with those who succeeded them. In the first century, Shī‘ah were those who believed that

1 *Al-Milal wa l-Niḥal* 6/146

2 Ibn al-Murtaḍā: *Al-Baḥr al-Zakḥkhār* pg. 96, Al-Muqbilī: *Al-Mu‘allim al-Shāniḥ* pg. 386, Ibn ‘Ibād: *Nuṣrat Madhāhib al-Zaydiyyah* pg. 164-169

3 Yahyā ibn Ḥamzah: *Al-Risālah al-Wāzi‘ah* pg. 28

4 Al-Samarqandī: *Al-Mu‘taqadāt* (scroll 35 of the manuscript).

‘Alī عليه السلام deserved precedence over ‘Uthmān عليه السلام. Thus there were Shī’īs and ‘Uthmānīs. A Shī’ī was one who granted precedence to ‘Alī over ‘Uthmān and an ‘Uthmānī was one who granted precedence to ‘Uthmān over ‘Alī عليه السلام.¹ Based on the above, the definition of the Shī’ah in the first century would be, “those who grant precedence to ‘Alī over ‘Uthmān عليه السلام.” They have no other beliefs that contradict those of the majority.²

This is why Ibn Taymiyyah stated that the former Shī’ah, who lived during the khilāfah of ‘Alī عليه السلام, would grant precedence to Abū Bakr and ‘Umar عليه السلام.³ Sharīk ibn ‘Abd Allāh — who was considered a Shī’ī — refused to refer to those who grant precedence to ‘Alī over Abū Bakr and ‘Umar عليه السلام as Shī’ah. He knew that this belief was in stark contradiction to that which was unambiguously and undeniably established from ‘Alī عليه السلام, since Tashayyu‘ means “obedience and support”, not opposition and disregard (for the opinions of the one who is to be followed).⁴

Ibn Baṭṭah reports from his teacher, who was well-known as Abū al-‘Abbās ibn Masrūq:

Reported to us by Muḥammad ibn Ḥumayd — Jarīr — Sufyān — from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ziyād ibn Jadīr who said, “Abū Ishāq al-Subay’ī came to Kūfah, so Shimr ibn Aṭīyyah said to us, ‘go to him!’ Thereupon we went to sit with him and they began speaking. Abū Ishāq said:

1 Refer to Nishwān Al-Ḥamīrī: *Al-Ḥūr al-‘Ayn* pg. 179, Ibn al-Murtaḍā: *Al-Munyah wa l-Amal* pg. 81

2 Even though they are referred to as Shī’ah, they are in fact part of the Ahl al-Sunnah. This is because the matter regarding ‘Alī and ‘Uthmān عليه السلام is a really insignificant matter. There is no way that one holding the opposite view could be taken as a deviate, as it is only a matter of khilāfah... Some of the Ahl al-Sunnah have differed with the majority regarding the matter of ‘Uthmān and ‘Alī عليه السلام, after agreeing that Abū Bakr and ‘Umar عليه السلام were undoubtedly given precedence over everyone else. Thus, some have said that ‘Uthmān was more virtuous whilst others said that ‘Alī عليه السلام was more virtuous. A third group also existed, who did not comment on the matter. However, the Ahl al-Sunnah eventually accepted the first view. Refer to *Majmū‘ah Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 3/153, Ibn Ḥajar: *Fath al-Bārī* 7/34

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/60

4 His exact words were quoted previously.

خرجت من الكوفة و ليس احد يشك فى فضل ابى بكر و تقدمهما و قدمت الان و هم
يقولون و يقولون ولا والله ما يقولون

When I left Kūfah, not a single soul doubted the virtue of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar عليه السلام and that they should be granted precedence. This time when I came they saying this and that and I do not know, by the oath of Allah, what they are saying!¹

Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb explains:

This is clear historical evidence which highlights the transformation of Shī‘ism. Abū Ishāq al-Subay‘ī was the leading and most prominent scholar of Kūfah.² He was born during the khilāfah of ‘Uthmān عليه السلام (three years before he was martyred) and he lived until the year 127 A.H. He was still a child during the Khilāfah of ‘Alī عليه السلام. He spoke about himself saying, “my father lifted me up so I could see ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib delivering a sermon. The hair of his head and beard was white.”

If we can establish the dates of his departure from Kūfah and the day he returned, we will be able to determine when were the Shī‘ah ‘Alawī (followers of ‘Alī عليه السلام), who followed their Imām in granting precedence to Abū Bakr and ‘Umar عليه السلام, and when did they start opposing ‘Alī عليه السلام and belying that which he believed, to the extent that he openly announced on the pulpit of Kūfah that his two brothers (Abū Bakr and ‘Umar عليه السلام) were the companions, viziers, and Khulafā’ of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, the best of the ummah in its purest and untainted eras.³

Layth ibn Abī Salīm said:

ادركت الشيعة الاولى و ما يفضلون على ابى بكر و عمر احدا

1 *Al-Muntaqā* pg. 360

2 Refer to *Tahdhīb Al-Tahdhīb* for his biography 8/63, *Al-Khulāṣah* pg. 291

3 *Hāshiyat al-Muntaqā* pg. 360-361

I met the very first group of Shī'ah. They would not grant superiority to anyone over Abū Bakr and 'Umar.¹

The author of *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* states that the Muhājirīn and Anṣār and those who followed them diligently, who lived in the era of 'Alī عليه السلام, all understood his rights and merits and treated him accordingly. Furthermore, they did not attempt to discredit any of his brothers from the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. Thus, declaring them kāfir and using foul language regarding them was extremely far-fetched.²

Whoever understands the constant modifications that came about in Shī'ī beliefs will not be surprised at all to see that many great *muḥaddithīn* (ḥadīth scholars) and scholars were referred to as Shī'ah. At times it is used for some who were the torchbearers of the Ahl al-Sunnah. This is simply because the term Shī'ah in its meaning and implications — in the first era — was totally different to that which it later became. Hence, whilst discussing those who were accused of being affected by the innovation of Shī'ism from the Muḥaddithīn, Imām al-Dhahabī states:

This innovation is of two types. 1) The minor innovation, such as being extreme as far as support for 'Alī عليه السلام is concerned, or supporting him without any extremism. This is common among the Tābi'īn and those after them. Along with this, they were religious, pious and truthful. If the aḥādīth of these people is to be rejected, then a great amount of aḥādīth of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم will be lost. 2) The major innovation, such as total Rafḍ, extremism in it, disparaging Abū Bakr and 'Umar عليه السلام and calling towards it. This type of Shī'ah (their narration) cannot be used as evidence and there is no hesitation regarding that. Not a single truthful or trustworthy person could be presented from this category until now. On the contrary, lies are their hallmark, and Taqiyyah and hypocrisy is their dress-code. Upon what stretch of logic can the narrations of one whose condition is such be accepted? Nay, their narration can never be accepted.

1 *Al-Muntaqā* pg. 360-361

2 *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* pg. 3

The first generation of Muslims considered a person to be an extremist Shī'ī if he spoke negatively regarding 'Uthmān, Zubayr, Ṭalḥah, Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه and others who had disagreed and clashed with 'Alī رضي الله عنه. On the other hand, the extremist in our times and our environments is the one who considers these luminaries to be out of the fold of Islam and he dissociates himself from Abū Bakr and 'Umar رضي الله عنه. This individual (who subscribes to the mentioned beliefs) is the deviant liar.¹

By now, it should be clear that Shī'ism had different levels, modifications, and phases just as it has many sects and groups. However, the sect which we have singled out as a subject of research, analysis and investigation is the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah, and the phase that we wish to study is the one which derives its beliefs and religion from the four seminal books (according to them) viz. *Al-Kāfī*, *Al-Tahdhīb*, *Al-Istibṣār* and *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* (these books hold the same status in their eyes that the six books of ḥadīth hold in the eyes of the Ahl al-Sunnah), the four later books which are *Al-Wāfī*, *Al-Biḥār*, *al-Wasā'il* and *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* and the other books (which are many in number) that the Shī'ī scholars believe to be of the same level as the above-mentioned books.

Before concluding our discussion on the definition of the word Shī'ah, we would like to highlight that majority of the books regarding sects define Shī'ah (the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah) as the followers of 'Alī... This could lead to a very erroneous understanding, which contradicts a belief which the ummah unanimously accepts, i.e. 'Alī رضي الله عنه had the same beliefs as the Shī'ah. The fact of the matter is that he was totally innocent from all that the Shī'ah concocted regarding him and his progeny.

Hence, it is necessary to add on to this definition that which will save a person from misunderstanding it, so it will be said, "they are those who claim to be the followers of 'Alī رضي الله عنه whereas, instead of following him, they have opposed him. Amīr al-Mu'minīn has nothing at all to do with their beliefs." Otherwise, it can be said that they claim to be the followers of 'Alī or they are the Rāfiḍah, as was

1 Al-Dhahabī: *Mīzān al-I'tidāl* 1/5-6, Ibn Ḥajar: *Lisān al-Mīzān* 1/9-10

explained. Some of the scholars have done so by saying, “(they are) the Rāfiḍah, who are believed to be part of the followers of ‘Alī عليه السلام.”¹ In essence, they are not on the path of the Shī‘ah of ‘Alī عليه السلام, who followed him, they merely claim so, and they are in reality the Rāfiḍah.

The Inception of the Shī‘ah and its Historical Roots

The Shī‘ah, with their current principles and beliefs, did not come about all of a sudden. Rather, Shī‘ism went through many different stages and it was developed over a very long period of time. It also split up into many different sects. Therefore, it goes without saying that studying the historical and ideological perspectives of Shī‘ism as far as the different stages that it underwent are concerned, would require a separate discussion and research. This is why the subject of this discussion is the inception of Shī‘ism and its historical roots. This absolves us of delving into their different stages and sects. We will start off by mentioning the views of the Shī‘ah from their sources which they consider reliable. This will be followed by the views of others. The reason behind this is that our research will not be truly academic and objective unless we mention the views of the people being discussed before presenting any other persons views regarding them.

Views of the Shī‘ah Regarding Their Inception

They could not even agree upon this. However, we will discuss three views, all of which are explained in their reliable books. After presenting each view, we will do an analysis thereof.

The First View

Shī‘ism is a very old religion. Its inception took place before Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم was even made a Messenger. Every single Nabī was asked to accept the Wilāyah of ‘Alī... Many tales have been fabricated by the Shī‘ah in order to prove this view. Among them is that which is reported in *al-Kāfī* from Abū al-Ḥasan:

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/106

ولاية على مكتوب في جميع صحف الانبياء ولن يبعث الله رسولا الا بنو محمد صلى الله عليه و اله
و وصية على عليه السلام

The Wilāyah of ‘Alī is written in all the books of the ambiyā’. Allah did not send any Rasūl except that he believed in the nubuwwah of Nabī ﷺ and the Wilāyah of ‘Alī عليه السلام.¹

It is reported from Abū Ja’far al-Bāqir that he said regarding the verse:

وَلَقَدْ عَهِدْنَا إِلَىٰ آدَمَ مِنْ قَبْلُ فَنَسَىٰ وَلَمْ نَجِدْ لَهُ عَزْمًا

And We had already taken a promise from Ādam before, but he forgot; and We found not in him determination.²

عهدنا اليه في محمد والائمة من بعده فترك و لم يكن له عزم و انما سمي اولوا العزم اولى العزم لانه عهد
اليهم في محمد و الاوصياء من بعده و المهدي و سيرته و اجمع عزمهم على ذلك كذلك و الاقرار به

We had taken a promise from him regarding Muḥammad and the Imāms that succeed him but he left it and he was not determined.³ The *Ulul ‘Azam* (the Messengers who held the loftiest ranks) were only given their title on account of the promise that was taken from them regarding Muḥammad, his Awṣiyā after him, the Mahdī and his account. All of them were determined to uphold it and they admitted it.⁴

1 Al-Kulaynī: *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/437

2 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 115

3 This explanation is an exaggerated stretch of the meaning of the verse. In fact, it is blasphemy! The pious predecessors and the later scholars have both explained the verse in the following manner, “we emphasised to Ādam saying to him, ‘indeed this (satan) is your enemy as well as your wife’s enemy. Ensure that he does not manage to get the two of you expelled from Jannah.’ However, he forgot that which he was told (by leaving it out). If he had determination, he would not have obeyed Iblīs who was jealous of him.” Qatādah says, “‘we did not find in him determination,’ i.e. perseverance.” (*Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 16/220-222)

4 Al-Kulaynī: *Al-Kāfī* 1/416, Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī: *‘Ilal al-Sharā’i’* pg. 122, Al-Kāshānī: *Al-Ṣāfī* 2/80, *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/65, Hāshim al-Bahrānī: *Al-Maḥajjah* pg. 635-636, Al-Majlisī: *Al-Biḥār* 11/35, 26/278, Al-Ṣaffār: *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* pg. 21

It is also reported in *Al-Biḥār* from Rasūlullāh ﷺ — as they falsely claim:

يا على ما بعث الله نبيا الا وقد دعاه الى ولايتك طائعا او كارها

O ‘Alī, Allah did not send any Nabī except that he made him admit your Wilāyah, whether he wished to or not.¹

Another narration from Abū Ja‘far al-Bāqir states:

ان الله تبارك و تعالى اخذ ميثاق النبيين بولاية على

Allah ﷻ took a promise from the ambiyā’ regarding the Wilāyah of ‘Alī.²

Reported from Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Šādiq:

ولايتنا ولاية الله لم يبعث نبي قط الا بها

Our Wilāyah is the Wilāyah of Allah. He did not send any Nabī except that he believed in it.³

In an attempt to prove this blasphemous belief, their scholar Al-Baḥrānī placed in his book a chapter which he named, “the ambiyā’ were sent upon the belief in the Wilāyah of ‘Alī”. They have said:

ثبت ان جميع انبياء الله و رسله و جميع المؤمنين كانوا لعلي بن ابي طالب محبين و ثبت ان المخالفين لهم كانوا له و لجميع اهل محبته مبغضين... فلا يدخل الجنة الا من احبه من الاولين و الاخرين فهو اذن قسيم الجنة و النار

1 *Al-Biḥār* 11/60, Al-Baḥrānī: *Al-Ma‘ālim al-Zulfā* pg. 303. This narration can also be found in *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* of al-Šaffār and *al-Ikhtišāṣ* of al-Mufid.

2 Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī: *Mustadrak al-Wasā’il* 2/195, *Al-Ma‘ālim al-Zulfā* pg. 303

3 *Al-Ma‘ālim al-Zulfā* pg. 303

It has been established that all the ambiyā' and messengers of Allah as well as all the believers were lovers of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. It has also been established that those who opposed them hated him and all those who loved him... Only those who loved him will enter Jannah, whether they were from the first generation or the last generation. Thus, he is the one who will divide the occupants of Jannah and Jahannam.¹

Narrations of the same meaning have appeared in many of their reliable books such as *al-Kāfi*², *Al-Wāfi*³, *Al-Biḥār*⁴, *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il*⁵, *al-Khiṣāl*⁶, *'Ilal al-Sharā'i'*⁷, *Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah*⁸, *Tafsīr Furāt*⁹, *al-Ṣāfi*¹⁰, *al-Burhān*¹¹, etc. They have so many narrations that corroborate this that al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī states in *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* (one of their eight canonical works) that the narrations which state that Allah took a promise from the ambiyā' when he created the creation are more than a thousand.¹²

The Shī'ī exaggeration does not end with what you have just read. Instead, they go on to claim:

الله عز اسمه عرض ولايتنا على السماوات و الارض و الجبال و الامصار

Allah, whose name is exalted, presented our Wilāyah upon the skies, earth, mountains and cities.¹³

1 Al-Kāshānī/*Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/16

2 Al-Kulaynī/*Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 2/8

3 Al-Kāshānī/*Al-Wāfi* 2/155, 3/10

4 Al-Majlisī/*Al-Biḥār* 35:151, Al-Qummī/*Safinat Al-Biḥār* 1/729

5 Al-Nūrī/*Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* 2/195

6 Al-Ṣadūq/*al-Khiṣāl* 1/ 270

7 Al-Ṣadūq/*'Ilal al-Sharā'i'* pg. 122, 135, 136, 143, 144, 174

8 Al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī/*Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah* pg. 158

9 *Tafsīr Furāt* pg. 11, 13

10 *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 2/80

11 Al-Baḥrānī 1/86

12 *Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah* pg. 159

13 Al-Nūrī/*Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* 2/195

This is why their scholar Hādī al-Ṭahrānī (who is presently one of their Āyāt and authorities) said:

تدل بعض الروايات على ان كل نبي امر بالدعوة الى ولاية على رضلى الله عنه بل عرضت الولاية على جميع الاشياء فما قبل صلح و ما لم يقبل فسد

Some narrations indicate that every nabī was instructed to invite towards the Wilāyah of ‘Alī. In fact, Wilāyah was presented to everything. Thereafter, whatever accepted it prospered and whatever rejected it got corrupted.¹

An Analysis of this View

There are some views and beliefs, the falsity of which can be highlighted by simply presenting them. This view, undoubtedly belongs to that category. The falsity of it is quite obvious. The Book of Allah, which is amidst us, does not lend support, in any possible way to this absurd claim. The call of the Messengers عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام was towards Towhīd — and not Wilāyah — as they falsely claim. Allah, the most exalted says:

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ قَبْلِكَ مِنْ رَسُولٍ إِلَّا نُوحِي إِلَيْهِ أَنَّهُ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا أَنَا فَاعْبُدُونِ

And We sent not before you any messenger except that We revealed to him that, “There is no deity except Me, so worship Me.”²

وَلَقَدْ بَعَثْنَا فِي كُلِّ أُمَّةٍ رَسُولًا أَنْ اعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ وَاجْتَنِبُوا الطَّاغُوتَ

And We certainly sent into every nation a messenger, [saying], Worship Allah and avoid the Ṭāghūt [idols and false gods].³

Every nabī and messenger of Allah called his nation towards worshipping Allah alone, without adding any partners. Nūḥ, Hūd, Ṣāliḥ and Shu‘āyb عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام all said to their nations:

1 Hādī al-Ṭahrānī/*Wadāyī‘ al-Nubiwwah* pg. 115

2 Sūrah al-Ambiyā’: 25

3 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 36

يَقُومُ اعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ مَا لَكُمْ مِنْ إِلَهٍ غَيْرُهُ

O my people, worship Allah; you have no deity other than Him.¹

Rasūlullāh ﷺ said:

امرت ان اقاتل الناس حتى يشهدوا ان لا اله الا الله و ان محمدا رسول الله

I have been commanded to wage war against people until they testify that there is no deity besides Allah and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah.²

Ibn ‘Abbās narrates from Rasūlullāh ﷺ, who said on the occasion of sending Mu‘ādh رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to Yemen:

انك تقدم على قوم من اهل الكتاب فليكن اول ما تدعوهم اليه عبادة الله عز و جل

You will be going to a nation from the People of the Book (Jews and Christians). The first thing that you should call them towards is the worship of Allah, the most honoured and glorious.³

Thus, the authentic Sunnah (aḥādīth) only state that which disproves this opinion. Similarly, “the luminaries among the pious predecessors were all unanimous regarding the fact that the first command towards which a person will be invited is the declaration of the Shahādatayn.”⁴ With this being the case, we are forced to

1 Sūrah al-A‘rāf: 59, 65, 73, 85

2 Reported by *al-Bukhārī* in Kitāb al-Īmān, the chapter (regarding the verse), “but if they should repent, establish ṣalāh, and give zakāh, let them [go] on their way.” (Sūrah al-Towbah: 5) (1/11), and *Muslim* in Kitāb al-Īmān, the chapter of being commanded to wage war against people until they say, “there is no deity besides Allah.” It has been reported by others as well.

3 Reported by *al-Bukhārī* and *Muslim* with similar wordings. The quoted version is reported by *Muslim*. Refer to *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, Kitāb al-Zakāh the chapter of the obligation of Zakāh (2/108) and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Kitāb al-Īmān, the chapter of inviting towards the Shahādatayn (1/50-51)

4 *Sharḥ al-Taḥāwīyyah* pg. 75

ask: What is the basis and origin of that which they claim regarding the Wilāyah of ‘Alī عليه السلام?

If the Wilāyah of ‘Alī عليه السلام appeared in the scriptures of all the ambiyā’, then why are the Rawāfiḍ the only people in the world who proclaim it? Why is it unknown to the religious people? Why was this Wilāyah not mentioned in the Qur’ān, which abrogates all the other Books and Scriptures, and the one which is protected by Allah the Most Exalted and Glorified? The reality is that it nothing but a baseless claim which will only be proclaimed by one who lacks in dīn, intellect and modesty; which would have prevented him from doing so.

Ibn Taymiyyah explains:

People have removed from the scriptures of the ambiyā’ those texts in which Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم was mentioned. None of them had any mention of ‘Alī عليه السلام... None of the Jews and Christians who have accepted Islam stated that ‘Alī was mentioned in their books, so how can it be said, “every nabī was sent after admitting to the Wilāyah of ‘Alī,” whereas they did not mention that to their nations and it was not narrated by anyone?¹

How did these tale-producers have the audacity to belittle the ambiyā’? How could they claim that Ādam عليه السلام and they rest of the ambiyā’ (with the exception of the Ulul ‘Azm) discarded the command of Allah regarding Wilāyah? This is indeed a great accusation! Wilāyah has no basis, and the accusations against the ambiyā’ are even worse! The greatest paradox is that the same people who have no limits to their extremism regarding the infallibility of the Imāms, unhesitatingly and impudently make these kind of claims regarding the best of Allah’s creation, i.e. the ambiyā’.

Is this not clear proof that the brains and souls of the people behind these tales are bereft of any knowledge and īmān? Is it not clear proof that they are filled with hatred for the pious and chosen servants and they have made it their objective to

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/46

work together against them? Can there be any doubt that they have used Shī'ism as a tool to penetrate into the matters of people and destroy their dīn? This is definitely the reality! Only an irreligious person can concoct these types of tales. This belief of theirs implies that the followers of the Imams are of a loftier status than the ambiyā' (excluding the Ulul 'Azm) as they followed the command whilst the ambiyā' left it out! Indeed, this is pure deviation!

The promise that Allah took from the ambiyā' عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ was that if He sends Muḥammad ﷺ as a Messenger whilst they are alive, they will believe in his nubuwwah and assist him. This was stated by Ibn 'Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ¹ and others. Allah ﷻ says:

وَإِذْ أَخَذَ اللَّهُ مِيثَاقَ النَّبِيِّينَ لَمَا آتَيْنَاكُمْ مِنْ كِتَابٍ وَحِكْمَةٍ ثُمَّ جَاءَكُمْ رَسُولٌ مُصَدِّقٌ لِمَا مَعَكُمْ لَتُؤْمِنُنَّ بِهِ وَلَتَنْصُرُنَّهُ ۚ قَالَ ءَأَقْرَرْتُمْ وَأَخَذْتُمْ عَلَىٰ ذَٰلِكُمْ إِصْرِي ۚ قَالُوا أَقْرَرْنَا ۚ قَالَ فَاشْهَدُوا ۚ وَأَنَا مَعَكُمْ مِنَ الشَّاهِدِينَ

And [recall, O People of the Scripture], when Allah took the covenant of the ambiyā', [saying], "whatever I give you of the Scripture and wisdom and then there comes to you a Messenger confirming what is with you, you [must] believe in him and support him." [Allah] said, "have you acknowledged and taken upon that My commitment?" They said, "we have acknowledged it." He said, "then bear witness, and I am with you among the witnesses."²

Thus, it is as if these people have taken that which was the accolade of Nabī ﷺ and attached it to 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, as per their habit. They were not asked to believe in the details of that with which Muḥammad ﷺ was sent, so how is it possible that they were asked to support one Ṣaḥābī out of all the believers? Further, the Muslims are unanimous regarding the fact that if a person believes in Nabī ﷺ and obeys him without being informed that Allah created Abū

1 Refer to *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 6/557 (The researched edition).

2 Sūrah al-A'rāf: 81

Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān, and ‘Alī عليه السلام, he will not be taken to task for it, and it will not affect his entry into Jannah. When this is the case regarding the ummah of Muḥammad صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم, then how can it be said that it was compulsory upon all the ambiyā’ to believe in one specific Ṣaḥābī?¹

If we may ask, what happened to the intellect of those who believe in this type of bunkum? How is it possible that promises were taken from all the ambiyā’ prior to us, as well as their nations that they will accept the Imāmah of ‘Alī عليه السلام? This is, as explained by Ibn Taymiyyah:

The speech of mentally deranged people. The ambiyā’ all passed away before Allah created ‘Alī عليه السلام, so how could he be their amīr? The most that can be claimed (as far as logic is concerned) is that he was the amīr of the people of his time. Claiming that he was the amīr and Imām of those who were created before him (his existence) as well as those who will be created after him (his death) can only be done by one who has absolutely no understanding of that which he is blurting out, and he is not shy to blurt nonsense...

This is from the same category as the claim of Ibn al-‘Arabī al-Ṭā’ī and his likes from the irreligious among the Sūfis who claim that the ambiyā’ acquire the benefit of knowledge from the lantern of the seal of awliyā’ (pious people), and those who only appeared six hundred years after Muḥammad صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم. Thus, the claim of these people is from the same category as the claim of those people regarding the pious. Both of them based their claims upon lies, extremism, shirk, false claims and opposition of the Qur’ān, Sunnah and the beliefs of the pious predecessors, regarding which they were unanimous.²

What exactly is the object and motive behind this type of claims, the falsity of which is apparent to all and sundry? Is it to deter people from the dīn of Allah?

1 Refer to *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/46

2 Ibid 4/78

Since the falsity of these claims are obvious, if they are spread and attributed to Islam, and the people of other religions happen to see them; they will doubt Islam itself (due to such beliefs, which defy logic as well as the revealed scriptures being attributed to Islam).

How do the intellectuals and people of knowledge react to this weird explanation regarding the corruption or prosperity of objects, plants, water, etc., that it is based on their position regarding the Wilāyah of ‘Alī عليه السلام? What will the world say regarding this? Is this the religion that they wish to present to people? Or is it simply that they wish to taint the image of Islam and prevent people from drawing close to it?

It is not surprising to see the Shī‘ah proclaiming this view, as they are the champions of bizarre exaggerations which belie undeniable realities and indisputable narrations, and they believe in that which is refuted by the intellect and divine texts. This is their view regarding the one who they claim to be their Imām. However, they have equally weird beliefs regarding those who they falsely believe to be his enemies. This is their belief regarding the first two rightly guided and celebrated khulafā’:

وقع فى الخبر ان القائم رضى الله عنه اذا ظهر يحييهم ويلزمهم بكل ذنب و فساد وقع فى الدنيا حتى قتل قابيل و هابيل و رمى اخوة يوسف له فى الجب و رمى ابراهيم فى النار و سايرها و كذا روى عن الصادق انه ما ازيل حجر من موضعه و لا اريقحت محجمة دم الا وهو فى اعناقهما-يعنى الخليفة الاول و الثانى-

It appears in a narration that *al-Qā’im* (their awaited saviour), when he emerges, will revive them and take them to task for every single sin and vice that took place in the world, even the murder of Hābīl by Qābīl, the casting of Yūsuf عليه السلام in the well by his brothers, the casting of Ibrāhīm (as in the fire and everything else). Similarly, it reported from al-Ṣādiq that not a stone moved, nor did a cup of blood be spilt, except that they will be responsible for it, i.e. the first and second Khalīfah.¹

1 Al-Baḥrānī: *Durrah Najafīyyah* pg. 37. Refer also to *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 205-206, *Al-Anwār al-Nu’māniyyah* 1/82.

The Second View (of the Shī'ah)

Some of the former as well as the latter day Shī'ah believe that Rasūlullāh ﷺ is the one who planted the seeds of Shī'ism, and that Shī'ism became apparent in his era. There were some Ṣaḥābah who became part of the Shī'ah of 'Alī رضي الله عنه and supported him from that era. Al-Qummī says:

فاول الفرق الشيعة وهي فرقة علي بن ابي طالب المسمون شيعة علي في زمان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وبعده معروفون بانقطاعهم اليه و القول بامامته منهم المقداد بن الاسود الكندي و سلمان الفارسي و ابو ذر جندب بن جنادة الغفاري و عمار بتن ياسر المذحجي...وهم اول من سموا باسم التشيع من هذه الامة

The first sect to appear was the Shī'ah, who are the sect of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. They were referred to as *Shī'at 'Alī* in the time of Nabī ﷺ as well after him. They are well known for confining themselves to him and believing in his Imāmah. Among them were Miqdād ibn Aswad al-Kindī, Salmān al-Fārsī Abū Dhar Jundub ibn Junādah al-Ghifārī and 'Ammār ibn Yāsir al-Madhḥajī... They were the first people to be referred to Shī'ah in this ummah.¹

This view is confirmed by al-Nawbakhtī² and al-Rāzī.³ Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā (d. 1373 A.H) says:

ان اول من وضع بذر التشيع في حقل الاسلام هو نفس صاحب الشريعة-يعنى ان بذرة التشيع وضعت مع بذرة الاسلام جنباً الى جنب و سواء بسواء ولم يزل غارسها يتعاهدها بالسقي و الرى حتى نمت و ازدهرت في حياته ثم اثمرت بعد وفاته

The first person to plant the seed of Shī'ism on the lands of Islam was the one upon whom the sharī'ah was revealed. This means that the seed of

1 *Al-Maqālāt wa l-Fīraq* pg. 15

2 *Fīraq al-Shī'ah* pg. 17, al-Shībī erred in quoting the view of al-Nawbakhtī by saying that he believed that Shī'ism started after the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Refer to *al-Ṣīlah Bayn al-Taṣarruf wa l-Tashayyū'* pg. 22

3 Refer to al-Rāzī (who was among the scholars of the Ismā'īliyyah) *Al-Zīnah* pg. 205 (of the manuscript).

Shī'ism was planted side by side and concurrently with the seed of Islam.¹
The one who planted it then took care of it by watering it and irrigating it until it grew and blossomed in his lifetime and bore its fruits after his demise.²

A group of present day Shī'ah subscribe to this view.³

An Analysis of this View

Firstly: the first person to proclaim this view was al-Qummī in his book *al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq* and al-Nawbakhtī in his book *Firaq al-Shī'ah*. Perhaps the most influential reason behind the invention of this view is that some Muslim scholars traced back the origin and growth of Shī'ism to foreigners. They had done so on account of the clear indications which prove this, as will be explained. Therefore, in an attempt to counter this, the Shī'ah tried to establish that their religion was divinely instated. In this way, they wish to refute the claims of their opposition that they have foreign roots. This is the reason behind this claim of theirs.

Every means and avenue was adopted by them to substantiate and support this view, including the fabrication of many aḥādīth against Rasūlullāh ﷺ.⁴ They then went on to claim that these are narrations that are reported by the Ahl al-Sunnah, whereas they are such narrations “which are unknown to the greatest

1 Take note of how he admits that the seed of Shī'ism is different to the seed of Islam.

2 *Aṣl al-Shī'ah* pg. 43

3 Refer to Muḥsin al-ʿĀmilī: *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1/13, 16, Muḥammad Jawād Mughniyah: *Al-Ithnā ʿAshariyyah wa Ahl l-Bayt* pg. 29, Hāshim Ma'rūf: *Tārīkh al-Fiqh al-Ja'farī* pg. 105, al-Wābilī: *Hawīyyat al-Tashayyu'* pg. 27, al-Shīrāzī: *Hākadhā al-Shī'ah* pg. 4, Muḥammad al-Ḥasanī: *Fī Zilāl al-Tashayyu'* pg. 50-51, al-Zayn: *Al-Shī'ah fī l-Tārīkh* pg. 29, 30, al-Muẓaffar: *Tārīkh al-Shī'ah* pg. 18, Al-Ṣadr: *Baḥth Ḥawl al-Wilāyah* pg. 63, Aḥmad Tuffāḥah: *Uṣūl l-Dīn* pg. 18, 19

4 The books on the subject of fabricated aḥādīth of the Ahl al-Sunnah have many narrations regarding this subject, which were narrated by the Rawāfiḍ. As examples, refer to *Al-Mowḍū'āt* of Ibn al-Jowzī 1/338s, al-Showkānī: *Al-Fawā'id al-Majmū'ah* pg. 342, al-Kattānī: *Tanzīh al-Sharī'ah* 1/351. They have many different ways and methods by which they try to establish proof against the Ahl al-Sunnah. I have written regarding this in my book *Fikrat al-Taqrīb* pg. 51.

scholars of the Sunnah as well as the conveyors of the sharī'ah. Most of them are either fabricated, reported by unreliable people or they have no relation to that which they wish to prove therefrom.”¹

Secondly: This view cannot be established from the Qur'ān and the Sunnah. It has no reliable historical chain of narration. Rather, it is a view that is alien to Islam and it contradicts established historic fact. Islam is a means of uniting this ummah upon the truth, not a means of dividing them into sects and parties. In the era of Nabī ﷺ, there was no mention of Shī'ah or Sunnī. Allah ﷻ says:

إِنَّ الدِّينَ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ الْإِسْلَامُ

Indeed, the religion in the sight of Allah is Islam.²

There is no mention of Shī'ism or anything else. They have admitted in their statement, “this means that the seed of Shī'ism was planted side by side and concurrently with the seed of Islam...” that Shī'ism is different to Islam. Allah ﷻ says:

وَمَنْ يَتَّبِعْ غَيْرَ الْإِسْلَامِ دِينًا فَلَنْ يُقْبَلَ مِنْهُ

And whoever desires other than Islam as religion — never will it be accepted from him...³

Among the undeniable historical facts which exposes the preposterousness of this view and its stark contradiction to the reality is that there were no Shī'ah in the era of Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.⁴ Some of the scholars of the

1 Ibn Khaldūn: *Al-Muqaddimah* 2/527, researched by 'Alī 'Abd al-Wāḥid Wāfi

2 Sūrah Āl-'Imrān: 19

3 Sūrah Āl-'Imrān: 85

4 Ibn Taymiyyah says, “during the khilāfah of Abū Bakr and 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا, there were no such people who were referred to as Shī'ah, and the word Shī'ah was not attached to any person's name.” *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/64, researched by Dr Muḥammad Rashād Sālim.

Shī'ah were forced to accept this reality, even though it is their temperament to deny established realities. Their Ayatollah and mujtahid of his time, Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā says:

...ولم يكن للشيعة والتشييع يومئذ (في عهد ابى بكر و عمر رضى الله عنهما) مجال للظهور لان الاسلام كان يجرى على مناهجه القويمة

There was no scope in that era (the eras of Abū Bakr and 'Umar رضي الله عنهما) for the Shī'ah to make an appearance, as Islam was upon its correct methodology and path.¹

A similar acknowledgement was made by another scholar of theirs, Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Āmilī who said:

ان لفظ الشيعة قد اهمل بعد ان تمت الخلافة لابي بكر و صار المسلمون فرقة واحدة الى اواخر ايام الخليفة الثالث

The word Shī'ah was left out after khilāfah was established for Abū Bakr and the Muslims became one group. This continued until the last days of the third khalīfah.²

We say: It was left out because it simply did not exist. How is it possible that it was left out and it did not make an appearance whereas you believe that the government was kāfir, as is stated so often in your books that it cannot be doubted that these are your beliefs (the quotations and necessary explanation will soon appear). How is it possible that the Muslims were split into different sects in the era of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, but they united during the eras of the three khulafā?

Thirdly: They claim that the Shī'ah were made up of 'Ammār, Abū Dhar and Miqdād رضي الله عنهم. Did any of these luminaries accept any of the beliefs and doctrines of the Shī'ah such as Naṣṣ, declaring Abū Bakr, 'Umar as well as majority of the

1 *Aṣl al-Shī'ah* pg. 48

2 *Al-Shī'ah fī l-Tārikh* pg. 39-40

Ṣaḥābah عليه السلام to be kāfir, etc.? Did they display any detachment, or dislike for them? Did they use foul language regarding them? Definitely not! None of the above can be established. The narrations and claims which appear in the books of the Shī'ah (who have filled volumes of books with these narrations) are nothing but a figment of their imagination. They were concocted by the imaginations of the jealous ones and the enemies.¹

Ibn al-Murtaḍā (who is a Zaydī Shī'ī) says:

فان زعموا ان عمارا و ابا ذر الغفاري و المقداد بن الاسود و سلمان الفارسي كانوا سلفهم لقولهم بامامة على اكذبهم كون هؤلاء لم يظهروا البراءة من الشيخين و لا السب لهم الا ترى ان عمارا كان عاملا لعمر بن الخطاب في الكوفة و سلمان الفارسي في المدائن

If they claim that 'Ammār, Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī, Miqdād ibn Aswad and Salmān al-Fārsī were their predecessors as they believed in the Imāmah of 'Alī, they are proven to be liars by the fact that neither did any display any kind of disassociation from Abū Bakr and 'Umar, nor did they revile them. Do you not see that 'Ammār was 'Umar's governor in Kūfah² and Salmān was his governor in Madā'in³ عليه السلام?⁴

These historical facts blow away all that claims that the Shī'ah have built up along the centuries.

Fourthly: Shaykh Mūsā Jār Allah believes that this view is a grave error committed by the Shī'ah, which has reached the pinnacle of insolence. It is a severe accusation

1 One such view is their fabrication that Zubayr, Miqdād and Salmān shaved their heads with the intention of fighting Abū Bakr عليه السلام. (*Rijāl al-Kashshī* number 210 pg. 133). Their narrations regarding this will fill up volumes of books. It should be noted that in this narration they mentioned Zubayr, whereas he later fought against 'Alī عليه السلام, and they forgot to mention Abū Dhar, 'Ammār and the Ahl al-Bayt.

2 Refer to Ibn al-Athīr: *Usd al-Ghābah* 4/46, Ibn Ḥajar: *al-Iṣābah* 2/506, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr: *Al-Istī'āb* 2/473.

3 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa'd* 4/87

4 *Al-Munyah wa l-Amal* pg. 124, 125

against Nabī ﷺ and it is an intolerable manipulation of words. He is especially surprised at their claim, “the first person to plant the seed of Shīʿism is the one upon whom the sharīʿah was revealed.” He remarks, “which seeds did Nabī ﷺ plant, that it grew into ears of reviling and declaring as disbelievers the Ṣaḥābah, and the best individuals of this ummah? It grew into ears of believing that the Qurʾān was adulterated by the hypocrites among the Ṣaḥābah, the unanimity of the ummah is deviation, and righteousness is when they are divided and the true beliefs hid inside the tidal wave of the deviation of the Shīʿah.”¹

The Third View

It is claimed that Shīʿism started on the Day of Jamal. Ibn al-Nadīm² says:

ان عليا قصد طلحة و الزبير ليقاتلهما حتى يفيئا الى امر الله جل اسمه فسمى من اتبعه على ذلك الشيعة فكان يقول شيعتي و سماهم عليه السلام الاصفياء الاولياء شرطة الخميس الاصحاب

‘Alī set out to fight Ṭalḥah and Zubayr so that they could once again submit to the law of Allah ﷻ. Thus, whoever followed him in this was called Shīʿah. He would say, “my Shīʿah,” and he named them, “the chosen ones, the guardians, the vanguards and the companions.”³

This is a view (as far as I know) that is only held by Ibn al-Nadīm. It seems as if he is indicating towards the appearance of the Shīʿah in the meaning of helpers and followers, and the historical date from which the word Shīʿah was used for the helpers of ‘Alī ﷺ, and that he was the one who named them Shīʿah. Thus, this view has no indication to the inception of Shīʿism as a separate sect with its own mind-set and principles. Here, the literal meaning of Shīʿah (which means helpers) is meant. This is why he used other titles with a similar meaning such as companions and guardians. It has already been explained that the expressions “my Shīʿah,” and “Shīʿah”, just as they were used by ‘Alī ﷺ, were also used by Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ.

1 *Al-Washīʿah*

2 Muḥammad ibn Ishāq ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Ya‘qūb al-Nadīm. He was a Mu‘tazilī Shīʿī. Among his works are *al-Fahrist*. He died in the year 438 A.H. (*Lisān al-Mizān* 5/72)

3 Ibn al-Nadīm: *al-Fahrist* pg. 175

Dr Muṣṭafā Kāmil al-Shībī (a contemporary Shī'ī from Egypt) states that this view of Ibn al-Nadīm is strange, due to him mentioning that Shī'ism was a title that 'Alī عليه السلام himself granted to his companions...¹ However, I do not see anything strange about 'Alī عليه السلام calling his helpers “my Shī'ah.” Dr Nashshār is of the view that there is some extremism² in the statement of Ibn al-Nadīm, but he does not explain the reason behind this view.

The Views of Non-Shī'ah Regarding the Inception of Shī'ism

The First View

Shī'ism started after the demise of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, as a result of some believing that 'Alī عليه السلام was most deserving of being the khalīfah. This view was stated by group of classical as well as contemporary scholars including 'Allāmah Ibn Khaldūn, Aḥmad Amīn and some orientalists. This view stems from that which is narrated by some that there were people at that time who felt that the relatives of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم were most deserving of being the khulafā' after him. In Khaldūn says:

The inception of this state (of the Shī'ah) was when Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم passed away and the Ahl al-Bayt opined that they are most deserving of the post, and that the khilāfah was reserved for their men, excluding everyone else.³

Aḥmad Amīn says:

The first seed of Shī'ism was the group that believed that after the demise of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم the Ahl al-Bayt were most deserving of succeeding him.⁴

1 *Al-Ṣilah Bayn al-Taṣawwuf wa l-Tashayyū'* pg. 18

2 *Nash'at al-Fikr al-Falsafī* 2/32

3 *Al-'Ibar* 3/170-171

4 *Fajr al-Islām* pg. 266, Refer to *Duḥā al-Islām* 3/209. Dr 'Alī al-Kharbūṭālī says, “we are of the view that Shī'ism started after the khilāfah was concluded in respect of Abu Bakr instead of 'Alī عليه السلام.” *Al-Islām wa l-Khilāfah* pg. 26. Muḥammad 'Abd Allāh 'Inān held the same view. Refer to *Tārīkh al-Jam'īyyāt al-Sirriyah* pg. 13

This view of Aḥmad Amīn (among others) is identical to that of the orientalist.¹

An Analysis of this View

This view has been adopted based upon the view that the relatives have the greatest right to khilāfah. There is no doubt that if there was such a view, then there was also a view that Sa'd ibn 'Ubadah should be appointed as the khalīfah and the Anṣār were most deserving of the post. This does not tell us of the inception and birth of any separate group or sect. Differences of opinion were an obvious and natural occurrence. They are the result of the system of consultation in Islam.

Hence, they differed in that meeting, however, “they did not separate until they agreed upon a decision. This cannot be considered a fight.”² All of them unanimously agreed to obey Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ heard the entire affair and he pledged allegiance to Abū Bakr in front of a crowd of witnesses. He even volunteered to join in the campaign against Banū Ḥanīfah.³ Their condition was one of mutual love and unity. They would put their lives and the best of their wealth in obedience to their khalīfah (Imām), just as they would do during the era of their Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.⁴

If the view of the Ahl al-Bayt being most deserving of the post was in reality the inception of Shī'ism, then undoubtedly they would have made some appearance in the era of Abū Bakr and 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. However, it was a view (if it is established) like all the other views that were expressed at the meeting at al-Saqīfah. If it was expressed, it was discarded after the bay'ah took place; unity was reached and all agreed upon one decision.

The stance of Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ demands that these views and opinions ceased to exist and came to an end among the Ṣaḥābah. It has been narrated from

1 *Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-Islāmiyyah* 14/58

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/36

3 *Al-Juwaynī: Al-Irshād* pg. 428

4 *Al-Nāshī al-Akbar: Masā'il al-Imāmah* pg. 15

him with tawātur¹ in many different ways that he proclaimed from the pulpit of Kūfah, “the best of this ummah after its Nabī is Abū Bakr and then ‘Umar’.”² Thus, how is it possible that any of the other Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ would believe regarding him that which he himself did not believe?

There is no mention of the Shī‘ah in the eras of Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān رضى الله عنه. Thus, how can it be claimed that their inception took place after the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.³ As mentioned, this reality has been accepted by some of the scholars of the Shī‘ah.

1 A narration reported by such a large number of people that it is inconceivable that they could have all agreed upon a lie.

2 Ibn Taymiyyah says, “it is reported from ‘Alī from approximately eighty sources or more that he said this on the pulpit of kūfah. A narration of Bukhārī which is reported by the men of al-Hamdān specifically, wherein ‘Alī رضى الله عنه says ‘if I was a doorkeeper of Jannah, I would say to Hamdān, ‘Enter in peace.’”. From the narration of Sufyān al-Thowrī who reports from — Mundhir al-Thowrī from — Hamdān-Al-Bukhārī from — Muḥammad ibn Kathīr from —Sufyān-Jāmi’ ibn Abī Rāshid from — Abū Ya‘lā-Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanaḥiyyah: “I asked my father, ‘who is the best of people after Rasūlullāh ﷺ?’ He replied, ‘Abu Bakr.’ I asked, “who is next?’ He replied, ‘then ‘Umar.’ I feared that he would say ‘Uthmān so I asked, ‘and then you?’ He replied, ‘I am one among the Muslims’. (Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī with *Fath al-Bārī* Kitāb Faḍā’il al-Ṣaḥābah Bāb Faḍl Abī Bakr 7/20) This was said to his son, in whose presence there is no way that he could have been doing Taqiyyah.” *Al-Fatāwā* 4/407-408, *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/137-138

3 That which has been narrated by some (that a group appeared after the demise of Nabī ﷺ who believed that ‘Alī رضى الله عنه was deserving of Imāmah) has no authentic historical evidence. It seems as if it is based upon the narration of al-Ya‘qūbī in his book on history, wherein he says, “a group, including Salmān, Abū Dhar, ‘Ammār and Miqdād delayed their pledge of allegiance to Abū Bakr and inclined towards ‘Alī.” (*Tārīkh al-Ya‘qūbī* 2/124) However, the narrations of al-Ya‘qūbī, and similarly al-Mas‘ūdī should be carefully studied or avoided. This is because they were inclined towards Shī‘ism. Thus, when a narration reflects their inclination towards Shī‘ism, then it becomes even more deserving of being discarded. Qāḍī Abū Bakr ibn al-‘Arabī comments regarding those narrations which are reported by them alone, “do not take the speech of any historian except al-Ṭabarī. Besides him, the rest are cancerous and deadly.” He further states regarding the historian al-Mas‘ūdī, “he was an innovator who was deceived.” (*Al-Awāṣim Min al-Qawāṣim* pg. 248-249) Another reason why al-Ṭabarī can be relied upon is that he narrates with chains of narration, which makes it possible to ascertain the authenticity of his narrations.

The Second View

Shī'ism started when 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه was murdered. Ibn Ḥazm states:

Thereafter, 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه assumed governance, and he remained for twelve years. His death was the cause of disputes, whereupon the Rawāfiḍ¹ were given birth to. The one who started the plantation of the seed of Shī'ism was 'Abd Allāh ibn Saba', (the Jew.²) who started his movement at the end of the era of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه.

1 *Al-Fiṣal* 2/8. This view of Ibn Ḥazm was held by other scholars as well, such as Shaykh 'Uthmān ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥanafī, the author of *Al-Firaq al-Muftariqah Bayn Ahl al-Zaygh wa l-Zandaqah*. Refer to *Al-Firaq al-Muftariqah* pg. 6. Similarly, the orientalist Wellhausen also held this view. Refer to *Al-Khawārij wa l-Shī'ah* pg. 112

2 'Abd Allāh ibn Saba' was the founder of the Saba'iyyah. He would claim that 'Alī was a deity, he believed in Raj'ah and he would revile the Ṣaḥābah. He was originally from Yemen. He was a Jew who portrayed himself to be a Muslim. In order to spread his mischief, he travelled to Ḥijāz, followed by Baṣrah and thereafter Kūfah. He entered Damascus during the reign of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه, but he was expelled by its people, due to which he turned towards Egypt, where he openly proclaimed his corrupt innovations. Ibn al-Ḥajar states: "'Abd Allāh ibn Saba' was among the extremist disbelievers (who adopted blasphemy as their trademark). He was astray and he would lead others astray. I think 'Alī burnt him in the fire." There are many narrations regarding his mischief, personal ideas and efforts in causing strife along with his cohorts in the books of sects, biographies, history etc., of both, the Ahl al-Sunnah as well as the Shī'ah. Refer to al-Milṭī: *Al-Tanbīh wa l-Radd* pg. 18, al-Ash'arī: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/86, al-Baghdādī: *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg. 233, al-Shahrastānī: *Al-Mīlāl wa l-Nihāl* 1/174, Al-Isfarāyīnī: *al-Tabṣīr fī l-Dīn* pg. 71-72, Al-Rāzī: *l'itiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn* pg. 86, Ibn al-Murtaḍā: *Al-Munyat wa l-Amal* pg. 29, Ibn Ḥajar: *Lisān al-Mīzān* 3/289, Ibn 'Asākir: *Tahdhīb Tārīkh Dimashq* 7/431, al-Sam'ānī: *al-Ansāb* 7/46, Ibn al-Athīr: *Al-Lubāb* 1/527, al-Maqdisī: *Al-Bad' wa l-Tārīkh* 5/129, *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/340, Ibn al-Athīr: *Al-Kāmil* 3/77, Ibn Kathīr: *Al-Bidāyah wa Al-Nihāyah* 7/167, Ibn Khaldūn: *Al-'Ibar* 2/160,161, al-Ṭabarī: *Tabṣīr Ulī al-Nuhā* paper 14 (of the manuscript)

Shī' sources: Al-Nāshī al-Akbar: *Masā'il al-Imāmah* pg. 22-23, al-Qummī: *al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq* pg. 20, al-Nawbakhtī: *Firaq al-Shī'ah* pg.22. Al-Kashshī reports a few narrations regarding Ibn Saba', refer to *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, narrations 170, 171, 172, 173 and 174 (from page 106-108), Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd: *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* 2/308

Many classical and modern-day researchers have insisted that he was the foundation and the first brick in the building of Shī'ism.¹ His existence has been narrated with tawātur in both, Shī'ī as well as Sunnī sources. However, a group of Shī'ah have sprung up in this era who attempts to deny his existence by simply striking their pens and blackening pages. They have no real grounds or solid proof² to prove their claim. Some of them even claim that 'Abd Allah ibn Saba' was in fact 'Ammār ibn Yāsir.³ These claims are an attempt or a strategy by which they wish to exonerate the Jews from the crime of conspiring against the Muslims. At the same time, it serves as a scheme by which they wish to attribute divinity to Rafḍ and silence the opposition, who have stated that Shī'ism has roots that are foreign to Islam.

The classical Shī'ī and Sunnī scholars did not have any difference of opinion concerning the existence and presence of 'Abd Allāh ibn Saba' during a certain

1 Ibn Taymiyyah, for example, is of the view that Ibn Saba' was the first person to claim that 'Alī عليه السلام was infallible and his appointment to Imāmah was divine. He wished to pollute Islam, just as Paulus polluted Christianity (*Majmū' Fatāwā* 4/518 (compiled by 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Qāsim)). Ibn al-Murtaḍā corroborates this view in his book *al-Munyat wa l-Amal* (pg. 125). From the modern-day scholars, Abū Zahrah (among others) states that Ibn Saba' was the greatest devil who was at the fore-front of the groups who were filled with hostility towards Islam and conspired against its adherents. He concocted the belief of the re-incarnation of 'Alī and that he was the appointed successor of Muḥammad صلى الله عليه وسلم, and he called towards this.

Abū Zahrah also states that ibn Saba' and his group were the greatest mischief-makers, in whose shadows the Shī'ī religion was formed. Refer to *Tārīkh al-Madhāhib al-Islāmiyyah* 1/31-33). Another scholar is Sa'īd al-Afghānī, who is of the view that Ibn Sabā' was one of the pioneers of a (Talmudic) secret society, whose ultimate dream was to crush the Islamic empire, and they were working towards empowering the Roman empire. Refer to *'Ā'ishah wa l-Siyāsah* pg. 60 and *al-Qaṣīmī fi l-Ṣirā'* 1/41.

2 Murtaḍā al-'Askarī in his book *'Abd Allāh ibn Saba'...* pg. 35 onwards.

3 'Alī al-Wardī in his book *Wu'āz al-Salāṭīn* pg. 274. He was parroted by another Shī'ī, i.e. Muṣṭafā al-Shībī in his book *al-Ṣilah bayn al-Ṭaṣawwuf wa l-Tashayyu'* pg. 40-41. The scholar 'Alī al-Baṣrī is of the view that al-Wardī was in fact parroting his teacher Hidāyat Alūḥakīm al-Hillī, who is a lecturer in the University of London, and he published these views of his in his book *Takhs Imām* (the first Imām). Al-Wardī published the translation thereof in his book *Wu'āz al-Salāṭīn*. Refer to *Majallat al-Thaqāfat al-Islāmiyyah*-Baghdād-edition 11 year 1, the article of 'Alī al-Baṣrī titled, "Alī al-Wardī-Another Attention Seeker".

period in history. Thus, how can something be denied after it has been established by both groups? The claim that he was ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir is rejected by the intellect, narrations and history. It is impossible that ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir subscribed to the beliefs that were proclaimed by Ibn Saba’. This claim is another offence carried out against the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and an insult to their integrity.

There is no need for me to delve into this matter as objective and comprehensive studies have already been penned down regarding the subject. Thus, it is unnecessary for us to continue discussing it.¹ At this juncture, it will be sufficient for us to reproduce that which appears in the reliable books of the Shī‘ah regarding Ibn Saba’. This will add weight to the argument in a few different senses. Firstly, it is in accordance to the standards of the discussion, i.e. basing our discussions upon their sources. Secondly, the claim that he did not exist came from the Shī‘ī camp. Thus, their claims will be uprooted if they are proven wrong from their reliable books. Thirdly, by presenting the views regarding Ibn Saba’ from Shī‘ī sources, a sketch of the roots and origin of Shī‘ism will be painted in their own words.

So what do the Shī‘ī books say regarding Ibn Saba’? The scholar of the Shī‘ah, Sa’d ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Qummī (d. 229-301), “the scholar, jurist and pride of the sect” (as described by al-Najāshī²) admits that he existed and mentions the names of some of his accomplices. He names their sect “the Saba’iyyah”. He also considers them

1 Among the most important and outstanding books on the subject is the book *‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ wa Atharuhū fī Ihḍāth al-Fitnah* by Dr Sulaymān al-‘Awdah. It is a comprehensive study wherein he scrutinises the speech of those who wish to create doubts, and deny the existence of Ibn Saba’ or claim that he was ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir. On the basis of proof and evidence, he established the preposterousness of these views.

Another scholar who disproves these views is Dr ‘Ammār al-Ṭālibī, who done so in his book *Ārā’ al-Khawārij* (pg. 75-81). Dr ‘Izzat Aṭīyyah also scrutinises and disproves these views in his book *al-Bid‘ah* (pg. 64). Dr Sa’dī al-Hāshimī did a valuable discourse on the subject, in which he proved the existence of Ibn Saba’ from the sources of both groups. (Refer to *Ibn Saba’ Ḥaqīqah lā Khiyāl* pg. 201-223 *Muḥāḍarāt al-Jāmi‘ah al-Islāmiyyah*, year 1399 A.H.-1998 C.E)

2 *Rijāl al-Najāshī* pg. 126

to be the first extremist Islamic sect. He believes that Ibn Saba' was:

اول من اظهر الطعن على ابي بكر و عمر و عثمان والصحابه و تبرء منهم و ادعى ان عليا رضى الله عنه امره بذلك

The first person to disparage Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān and the Ṣaḥābah. He dissociated himself from them and claimed that 'Alī عليه السلام commanded him to do so.

Al-Qummī mentions that 'Alī was informed of this, whereupon he ordered that he should be killed. However, he later decided against this and sufficed upon expelling him to al-Madā'in.¹ He also quotes from a group of scholars (as he describes them):

ان عبد الله بن سبا كان يهوديا فاسلم و والى عليا و كان يقول وهو على يهوديته فى يوشع بن نون وصى موسى بهذه المقالة فقال فى اسلامه بعد وفاة رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فى على بمثل ذلك و هو اول من شهد ب القول بفرض امامة على بن ابي طالب و اظهر البراءة من اعداءه... و اكفرهم فمن هاهنا قال من خالف الشيعة ان اصل الرفض ماخوذ من اليهودية

'Abd Allāh ibn Saba' was a Jew who embraced Islam and accepted the Wilāyah of 'Alī. Whilst he was a Jew, he would believe that Yūsha' ibn Nūn was the Waṣī of Mūsā عليه السلام, so after embracing Islam, he believed in the same concept with regards to 'Alī عليه السلام. He was the first person to proclaim that the Imāmah of 'Alī was compulsory and he dissociated himself from his enemies... and declared them disbelievers. On account of this, those who oppose the Shī'ah say that the Rafḍ is based upon Judaism.²

Thereafter, al-Qummī quotes the words of Ibn Saba' when the news of the demise of 'Alī عليه السلام reached him, wherein he claimed that he did not pass away but rather will return back to the world and in this manner did he adopt extremism.³

1 Al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq pg. 20

2 Al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq pg. 20

3 Al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq pg. 21

You have just read the statement of al-Qummī regarding Ibn Saba', and al-Qummī is described by the Shī'ah as, "reliable and an expert on the science of narrations."¹ His knowledge, according to them, is extremely lofty, as a result of it being collected at a very early stage. Also, Sa'd al-Qummī, as narrated by their scholar who was given the title *al-ṣadūq* (the honest one), that is Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, met their infallible Imām Ḥasan al-'Askarī (as they believe) and heard from him.²

Their scholar, al-Nawbakhtī agrees with all that which has been mentioned by al-Qummī regarding Ibn Saba', even as far as the wording is concerned.³ He is considered by them to be reliable.⁴ Al-Kashshī reports six narrations regarding Ibn Saba'⁶ in his famous book *Rijāl al-Kashshī*. This book is the oldest and most reliable book of the Shī'ah on the science of narrators. Those narrations imply that Ibn Saba' claimed nubuwwah and that Amīr al-Mu'minīn is Allah — Allah is exalted and pure of these allegations! It also mentions that 'Alī عليه السلام commanded him to repent, but he refused to do so, whereupon he had him burnt alive. Al-Kashshī mentions that he would concoct lies in the name of 'Alī عليه السلام and he quotes the curses of the Imāms regarding 'Abd Allāh ibn Saba' as well. 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn said:

لعن الله من كذب علينا انى ذكرت عبد الله بن سبا فقات كل شعرة فى جسدى لقد ادعى امرا عظيما ما له
لعنه الله كان على رضى الله عنه و الله عبدا لله صالحا اخو رسول الله ما نال الكرامة من الله الا بطاعته

May curse of Allah be upon the one who fabricates in our names. When
I think of 'Abd Allāh ibn Saba' every hair on my body stands on end. He

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fahrist* pg. 105, al-Ardabīlī: *Jāmi' al-Ruwāt* 1/352

2 Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī: *Ikmāl al-Dīn* pg. 425-435

3 *Firaq al-Shī'ah* by al-Nawbakhtī pg. 22-23

4 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fahrist* pg. 75, al-Ardabīlī: *Jāmi' al-Ruwāt* 1/228, 'Abbās al-Qummī: *al-Kunnā wa l-Alqāb* 1/148, al-Ḥā'irī: *Muqtabas al-Athar* 16/125

5 He is regarded by them as "reliable and well-versed with narrations and narrators". (al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fahrist* pg. 171)

6 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 106-108, 305

propagated a most heinous belief, what is wrong with him, may Allah curse him. ‘Alī عليه السلام was, by the oath of Allah, a pious slave of Allah and the brother of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. He only achieved honour from Allah on account of his obedience to Allah.¹

After mentioning these narrations, al-Kashshī says:

ذكر اهل العلم ان عبد الله بن سبا كان يهوديا فاسلم و والى عليا و كان يقول وهو على يهوديته فى يوشع بن نون وصى موسى بهذه المقالة فقال فى اسلامه بعد وفاة رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فى على بمثل ذلك و كان اول من شهد بالقول بفرض امامة على و اظهر البراءة من اعداءه و كاشف مخالفيه و اكفرهم فمن هاهنا قال من خالف الشيعة ان اصل الرفض ماخوذ من اليهودية

‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ was a Jew who embraced Islam and accepted the Wilāyah of ‘Alī. Whilst he was a Jew, he would believe that Yūsha‘ ibn Nūn was the Waṣī of Mūsā عليه السلام, so after embracing Islam, he believed in the same concept with regards to ‘Alī عليه السلام. He was the first person to proclaim that the Imāmah of ‘Alī was compulsory and he dissociated himself from his enemies, exposed them and declared them disbelievers. On account of this, those who oppose the Shī‘ah say that the Rafḍ is based upon Judaism.²

This is the statement of al-Kashshī, which corresponds to the statement of al-Qummī and al-Nawbakhtī, all of whom authenticate their statements by attributing them to the people of knowledge.

In addition, all of these narrations appear in *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, which they accept as one of the four references which can be relied upon regarding the science of narrators. This book was systemised by Shaykh al-Ṭā‘ifāh al-Ṭūsī, due to which its reliability and the value of research therein was multiplied manifold in their sight. This is because it was a combined effort of al-Kashshī, who is regarded by them as reliable and well-versed in sciences of narrations and narrators, as well

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 108

2 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 108-109

as al-Ṭūsī, who is the author of two of their four canonical books as well as two of their reliable books (according to them) on the science of narrators.¹

Many of their other books on the science of narrators have mentioned Ibn Saba². An example of this is the book which is considered as the most important and all-encompassing book on narrators in this day and age, i.e. *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*³ by their scholar ‘Abd Allāh al-Mamaqānī⁴ (d. 1351). It is for this reason that another approach can be noticed among some of the contemporary Shīʿī scholars, i.e. they abstain from denying that he existed. As an example, Muḥammad al-Zayn says:

و على كل حال فان الرجل اى ابن سبا كان فى عالم الوجود و اظهر الغلو و ان شك بعضهم فى وجوده
وجعله شخصا خياليا... اما نحن بحسب الاستقراء الاخير فلا نشك بوجوده و غلوه

Nevertheless, the man (Ibn Saba) existed and he was an open extremist, even though some of them have doubted his existence and felt that he was an imaginary individual. As far as we are concerned, in accordance to the latest research, we have no doubt regarding his existence and extremism.⁵

1 That which we have quoted from al-Kashshī was from the systemisation and selection of al-Ṭūsī, as the original (as they claim) no longer exists. Refer to *Muqaddimat Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 17, 18, Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī: *Lu’lu’at al-Baḥrayn* pg. 403

2 Perhaps the oldest source of the Shīʿah wherein ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ and Saba’iyyah is mentioned is the book *Masā’il al-Imāmah* pg. 22-23 by ‘Abd Allāh al-Nāshī’ al-Akbar (d. 293 A.H). One may read his biography in the books *Wafayāt al-A’yān* 3/91-92 and *Anbā al-Ruwāt* 2/128-129. Among their books on narrators which mention Ibn Saba’ are *Muntahā al-Maqāl* (which has no page numbers) by al-Māzindarānī, *Manhaj al-Maqāl fī Taḥqīq Aḥwāl al-Rijāl* (pg. 203-204) by al-Istarbādī, *Jāmi’ al-Ruwāt* (1/485) by al-Ardabīlī, *al-Rijāl* (2/71) by Ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥillī, *Qāmūs al-Rijāl* (5/461) by al-Tastarīs, *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* (pg. 51), etc.

Among their books of ḥadīth and fiqh wherein he is mentioned are *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū l-Faqīh* (1/213) by Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, *al-Khiṣāl* (pg. 628), *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* (2/322) by al-Ṭūsī, *Biḥār al-Anwār* (25/286) by al-Majlisī.

3 *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* 2/183

4 Al-A’lamī: *Muqtabas al-Athar* 21/230

5 *Al-Shīʿah fī l-Tārīkh* pg. 213

This approach rescues them, because if they deny his existence, they will be discrediting and belying their scholars (even though they have not clearly stated so) who have mentioned Ibn Saba', and their books on narrators wherein he is repeatedly mentioned. It will also be an unintentional acknowledgement from them that their books on narrators cannot be relied upon and they hold no weight, even if all of them state the same view.

Thus, it is admitted in the books of the Shī'ah that Ibn Saba' was the first person to claim that 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was divinely appointed, he will be reincarnated and he was also the first person to revile the first three khulafā' and the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. These are ideas and beliefs which later became the foundation of Shī'ism, as they, as well as other beliefs were given the form of narrations and aḥādīth and they were falsely, deceptively and shamelessly attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt. This duped many of the ignorant masses, non-Arabs and others into accepting them.

The Third View

Shī'ism started in the year 37 A.H. Among the most famous people to hold this view is the author of *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* who says:

The name Shī'ah became known in the year 37 A.H.¹

This view is also held by Montgomery Watt who says:

The Shī'ī movement started on one of the days of the year 658 CE (37 A.H).²

It seems as if this view links Shī'ism to the incident of Ṣiffīn — which occurred in the year 37 A.H between 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ — and that all the incidents that followed and all the effects that came about resulted from this incident. However, this view is not related to the inception of Shī'ism as far as its principles

¹ *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* pg. 5

² Montgomery Watt, *Islam and the Integration of Society* pg. 104

are concerned, as none of the books of history state that the proclamation of the views of divine appointment of ‘Alī عليه السلام as the khalīfah, his Raj‘ah or any of the other famous beliefs of the Shī‘ah were among the happenings of this year.

It is impossible that the supporters of ‘Alī عليه السلام were upon the religion of the Shī‘ah, or that they adopted any of their principles. This is despite the fact that among the ranks of the supporters of ‘Alī as well as Mu‘āwiyah عليه السلام were some enemies of Islam who acted as if they were Muslims in order to plot against Islam from the inside. The Saba’iyyah were definitely highly influential in stirring up strife. This cannot be denied. However, it should be noted that prior to the arbitration as well as in the write up thereof, the word Shī‘ah was used for both parties without singling out any of them, as was explained.

The Fourth View

Shī‘ism started after the martyrdom of Ḥusayn عليه السلام. R Strothmann¹ says:

The blood of Ḥusayn was the first seed of Shī‘ism in the form of beliefs.²

The Preferred View

We have presented most of the views regarding the inception of Shī‘ism, along with an analysis of each view. However, my view is that Shī‘ism as a separate ideology and set of beliefs did not come into being all of a sudden. It went through different stages along and transformed over a period of time. Nonetheless, the first signs thereof and the core fundamentals were first proclaimed by the Saba’iyyah, as admitted in the books of the Shī‘ah, which state that he was the first person to claim that the Imāmah of ‘Alī was compulsory and that he was the Waṣī of Muḥammad صلى الله عليه وسلم (as explained). This is the basis of Shī‘ism according to the scholars, whose statements have already been quoted under the definitions of Shī‘ism.

1 Rudolf Strothmann was among the orientalists who studied religions and sects. He has penned down discussions regarding them. Among his works are Cult of Zaidi, as well as four Isma‘ilī books. Refer to Najīb al-‘Aqīqī: *al-Mustashriqūn* 2/788.

2 *Dā‘irat al-Ma‘ārif al-Islāmiyyah* 14/59

Shī'ī books also admit that Ibn Saba' was the first person to openly disparage Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه — who were the in-laws of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, his relatives, his successors and the closest of people to him. He was also guilty of reviling the other Ṣaḥābah. The beliefs of the Shī'ah in respect of the Ṣaḥābah are identical to the above-mentioned, and they are recorded in their most reliable books. Furthermore, Ibn Saba' believed in the Raj'āh of 'Alī,¹ a belief which is also among the fundamental beliefs of the Shī'ah, as will be explained. Another belief of Ibn Saba' to which they also subscribe is that 'Alī رضي الله عنه and his Ahl al-Bayt were granted a special knowledge which was confined to them, as indicated to by Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah² (d. 95/100 A.H.) in *Risālat al-Irjā*.³

These beliefs have become the fundamental beliefs of the Shī'ah. *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* contains narrations which indicates that these beliefs came about at a very early stage, and that 'Alī رضي الله عنه enquired regarding them. He was asked, “do you people (Ahl al-Bayt) have any knowledge that is not mentioned in the Qur'ān or is not known to anyone else?” He answered by strongly denying this.⁴ These are the

1 Al-Qummī: *al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq* pg. 21, al-Nawbakhtī: *Firaq al-Shī'ah* pg. 23, al-Nāshī al-Akbar: *Masā'il al-Imāmah* pg. 22-23, al-Ash'arī: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/86, al-Milṭī: *al-Tanbīh wa l-Radd* pg. 18, al-Baghdādī: *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg. 234, al-Isfarāyīnī: *al-Tabṣīr fi l-Dīn* pg. 72, al-Rāzī: *Muḥaṣṣal Afkār al-Mutaqaddimīn wa l-Muta'akhkhirīn* pg. 242, Al-Īyji: *al-Mawāqif* 419

2 Ibn Hajar says: “Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, Abū Muḥammad al-Madanī. His father was well known by the name Ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah. He has a booklet concerning Irjā which was narrated along with its isnād by Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-'Adnī in his book *Kitāb al-Īmān*.” Refer to *Tahdhīb Al-Tahdhīb* 2/32

3 *Risālat al-Irjā* (inside *Kitāb al-Īmān* of Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-'Adnī pg. 249-250)

4 Al-Imām *Al-Bukhārī* reports this ḥadīth under the following chapters: writing down knowledge 1/204 (*al-Bukhārī ma'a al-Fath*), the sacredness of al-Madīnah 4/81, the freeing of captives 6/167, the protection and care offered by Muslims 6/273, the sin of the one who promises and then breaks his promise 6/279, 280, the sin of the slave who dissociates himself from those who freed him 12/41-42, blood money 12/246, a Muslim is not killed in lieu of a Kāfir 12/260, the prohibition of delving deep into matters, fighting and being extreme 13/275-276, Muslim reports it under the chapters: the virtue of al-Madīnah and its sacredness 9/143-144, the book on animal slaughter 13/141 (*Muslim ma'a Sharḥ al-Nawawī*), al-Nasā'ī reports it in *al-Mujtabā* 8/19, *Sunan al-Tirmidhī* 4/668, *Musnad Aḥmad* 1/100.

most important beliefs of the Shī'ah,¹ which were traced immediately after the martyrdom of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه, in the era of 'Alī رضي الله عنه. However, they were not accepted in the form of a set of beliefs by any specific and known sect. In fact, he Saba'iyyah did not raise their heads, except that 'Alī رضي الله عنه fought against them.²

Unfortunately, the events that took place after this (the Battle of Ṣiffīn, the incident of the arbitration that followed it, the assassination of 'Alī رضي الله عنه and the killing of Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه) created a perfect environment for these ideas to be propagated and kept up by a specific group and sect. All of these incidents stirred up the emotions of people and prompted them to support the Ahl al-Bayt. Therefore, the idea of supporting 'Alī رضي الله عنه and his household began penetrating the hearts of people, but it was then hijacked and misused by all those who wanted to destroy Islam, whether they were irreligious, hypocrites or satanic. In this manner, the infiltration of foreign ideas and beliefs into the Muslims took place, all under the guise of support for 'Alī رضي الله عنه, as it was the easiest path. Thereafter, with the passing of time, this innovation began spreading and its danger thereof was intensified, as Ibn Saba' now had many successors.

During the era of 'Alī رضي الله عنه, the title 'Shī'ah' meant nothing else but support and help. It was not related in any way to the present-day beliefs of the Shī'ah. Further,

1 It is important to take note of that the strong link between the inception of Shī'ism and Ibn Saba' are confined to the extremist Shī'ah (who are the majority in this era). as for "the moderate Shī'ism which merely grants precedence to 'Alī رضي الله عنه and this type of beliefs, this was not started by the irreligious ones, as opposed to the sect that claims he was divinely appointed and he was infallible. This sect was started off by a hypocrite who was irreligious." Ibn Taymiyyah: *Majmū'ah al-Fatāwā* 20/466. The person referred to is Ibn Saba' and his cronies from the Jews, hypocrites, jealous people and mentally instable persons.

2 He ordered that those who believe that he is a deity should be burnt. Refer to Ibn Taymiyyah: *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (researched by Dr Muḥammad Rashād Sālim, *Faṭḥ al-Bārī* 2/270, al-Milṭī: *al-Tanbīh wa l-Radd* pg. 18, al-Isfarāyīnī: *al-Tabṣīr fī l-Dīn* pg. 70. As for the Saba'iyyah who would revile Abū Bakr and 'Umar, he summoned Ibn al-Sowdā' (who was believed to be the perpetrator of these crimes). It is said that he intended to kill him but he escaped and fled. Regarding the Mufaḍḍilah, i.e. those who grant 'Alī's superiority over Abū Bakr and 'Umar, he said, "If anyone is brought to me who says that I am superior to Abū Bakr and 'Umar, I will mete out to him the punishment of false accusations." *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/219-220

this word or title was confined to the supporters of ‘Alī عليه السلام. This is proven from the record of the arbitration, in which the word Shī‘ah was used for both, the supports of ‘Alī (ra as well as the supports of Mu‘āwiyah عليه السلام. The details of this have already passed.

Thus, the tragedies that that were faced by the Ahl al-Bayt (the martyrdom of ‘Alī عليه السلام, the martyrdom of Ḥusayn عليه السلام, etc.) were among the influential causes for people to unhesitatingly support the Ahl al-Bayt. However, this matter was hijacked by the enemies, who were impatiently awaiting the occurrence of calamities among the Muslims. Thus, they found this to be an opportune moment and a perfect reason to infiltrate the ranks of the Muslims.

Among their ‘achievements’ thereafter was that they split the ranks of the ummah and they managed to achieve, through plotting and planning, that which they failed to achieve by means of weapons and arms. Shī‘ism was the realisation of the dream of all those who longed for the downfall of Islam and conspired against it. This is why it also attracted many conspirators of other religions. Once they managed to form a sect, they began laying down the ‘inspired and revealed’ principles of their religion, and they attributed it to Islam. This will be discussed next under the topic, “the origins of Shī‘ism”.

The Origins of Shī‘ism

The scholars and researchers have differed regarding the origins of Shī‘ī beliefs. Some have stated that it has Jewish origins, others have stated that it has Persian origins, a third group says that it was the home of old Asian beliefs such as Buddhism.¹ There are other views as well.

1 They are the followers of Buddha. They are scattered across Asia and the beliefs of the different groups differ Buddha. Japanese Buddhists believe that he is a god who is embodied in the universe. The Buddhists of India (from where it started) do not have a deity. The Buddhists of China are inclined towards the belief that there is one deity who manifests himself in the form of different people and Buddha was one of them. for more details, refer to Muḥammad Sayyid Kīlānī: *Dhayl al-Mīlāl wa l-Niḥāl* pg. 13, 26, 31, Muḥammad Abū Zahrah: *al-Diyānāt al-Qadīmah* pg. 53, Sulaymān Maẓhar: *Qīṣṣat al-Diyānāt* pg. 73

The View that it has Jewish Roots

There are some researchers who believe that Shī'ism has a Jewish flavour to it. This conclusion is reached due to two different reasons:

Firstly, Ibn Saba' was the first person to believe in the divine appointment of 'Alī عليه السلام and Raj'ah, and Ibn Saba' was a Jew. These ideas went on to become the core principles of Shī'ism. It is for this reason that al-Qummī, al-Nawbakhtī and al-Kashshī (who were among the classical Shī'ī scholars) have indicated towards this, after gathering and reviewing the ideas of Ibn Saba' which were later 'elevated' to degree that they became the founding principles of Shī'ism. They state:

فمن هنا قال من خالف الشيعة ان اصل الرفض مأخوذ من اليهودية

This is why those who oppose the Shī'ah say that the origin of Rafḍ is Judaism.¹

Secondly, there is a degree of resemblance between the foundations of Judaism and Shī'ism. Perhaps the first and most encompassing statement that was pronounced regarding this² is that which is reported from al-Sha'bī³. Ibn Ḥazm indicates to a portion thereof. He says:

These Shī'ah are treading the path of the Jews who believe that Ilyās عليه السلام and Fanḥās ibn al-Āzār ibn Hārūn عليه السلام are alive up until today.⁴

1 Refer to al-Qummī: *al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq* pg. 20, al-Nawbakhtī: *Firaq al-Shī'ah* pg. 22, *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 108

2 'Āmir ibn Sharāḥīl ibn 'Abd Dhī Kibār al-Sha'bī. A narrator from the Tābī'īn. He had a phenomenal memory (d. 102 A.H.) *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 5/5

3 Reported by al-Khallāl in *Kitāb al-Sunnah*. The researcher of the book says that the isnād is unreliable as it contains 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Mālik ibn Mighwal whose narrations were not accepted. However, whatever has been mentioned therein is found among the Rāfiḍah. *Al-Sunnah lil-Khallāl* 2/563-565, *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/6-10, al-Lālikā'ī: *Sharḥ Uṣūl I'tiqād Ahl al-Sunnah*, *Kāshif al-Ghummaḥ fī I'tiqād Ahl al-Sunnah* pg. 611, Ibn al-Jowzī: *al-Mowḍū'āt* 1/337, Ibn Bakr: *al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān* pg. 233-234 (of the manuscript).

4 *Al-Fiṣal* 5/37

Ibn Taymiyyah says that the Shī'ah in their extremism, ignorance and following of desires resemble the Jews in certain aspects and the Christians in other aspects.¹ People have always described them in this manner. Thereafter he quotes the statement of al-Sha'bī regarding their resemblance to the Jews and Christians. Many researchers have held this view.²

The View that Shī'ism is of Persian Origin

Some researchers are of the opinion that Shī'ism has Persian links. This is due to the following factors:

Firstly, as stated by Ibn Ḥazm and al-Maqrīzī, the Persians had a vast kingdom, they had dominance over all other nations and they were overawed by themselves to the extent that they would call themselves the free ones (as opposed to slaves) and the masters and the rest of the nations were considered by them, to be their slaves. Thus, when their kingdom came to an end at the hands of the Arabs (who they viewed as the people of the least potential) they were dumbstruck and mind boggled. No calamity could not have been worse than this.

Hence, they planned a number of physical attacks against the Muslims. However, on each of these occasions, Allah granted dominance to the truth. Thereupon, they realised that waging a subtle ideological war against the Muslims would be

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/6

2 Among them is Ahmad Amīn who says, "Judaism became apparent in Shī'ism, as they believed in Raj'ah and they claimed that the Shī'ah are forbidden upon Hell except for a few moments just as the Jews said, "Hell will not touch us, except for a few days". Christianity became apparent due to the speech of some of them who said, "the relationship between Allah and the Imam is the same as the relationship between Him and the Messiah." Refer to *Fajr al-Islām* (pg. 276). Goldziher is of the view that the concept of Raj'ah crept into the Shī'ah due to Jewish and Christian influences. Refer to *al-'Aqīdah wa l-Sharī'ah* (pg. 215). Similarly, Friedlaender states that the core ideologies and doctrines of Shī'ism were donated to it by Judaism. Refer to *al-'Aqīdah wa l-Sharī'ah* pg. 100. Wellhausen says that their origins go back to Judaism, and he points out some of the beliefs which are common between the Jews and the Shī'ah. *Aḥzāb al-Mu'arīdah* pg. 170

more productive. The result of this was that some of them hypocritically came across as Muslims and won the confidence of some of the supporters of ‘Alī عليه السلام by ostentatiously expressing their love for the Ahl al-Bayt and condemning the oppression that ‘Alī عليه السلام underwent (according to them). Thereafter, they steered them onto paths which distanced them from the path of guidance.¹

Secondly, the Arabs believed in freedom (in choosing their rulers) whereas the Persians believed that kingdom was inherited and restricted to the family in authority. The idea of choosing the khalīfah was unheard of by them. Thus, since Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم passed away and he did not leave behind any sons, the most deserving person of leadership would be his cousin, ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام. Consequently, whoever else assumed the post of khilāfah — such as Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān — all snatched the post from the one who was most deserving of it.

Added to that, the culture of the Persians was to consider the ruler to be — to some degree — divine. As a result, they viewed ‘Alī عليه السلام and his progeny in the same light. They would say, “obedience to the Imām is compulsory. Obeying him is in fact obedience to Allah.”² Many Persians had accepted Islam, but they did not rid themselves of all their previous beliefs, which they inherited generation after generation. Thus, with the passing of time, they merely gave their old ideologies an Islamic flavour. Hence the view of the Shī‘ah regarding ‘Alī and his progeny is the exact same view that was held by their forefathers regarding the rulers.

Shaykh Abū Zahrah says:

We believe that the Shī‘ah were affected by Persian ideologies regarding kingdom and inheritance, as the resemblance between their religion

1 Ibn Ḥazm: *al-Fiṣal* 2/273, al-Maqrīzī: *al-Khuṭaṭ* 2/262

2 Muḥammad Abū Zahrah: *Tārikh al-Madhāhib al-Islāmiyyah* 1/37, Aḥmad Amīn: *Fajr al-Islam* pg. 277, ‘Irfān ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd: *Dirāsāt fī l-Firaq* pg. 23, Wellhausen: *Aḥzāb al-Mu‘āriḍah al-Siyāsiyyah al-Dīniyyah fī Ṣadr al-Islām* pg. 168, Vloten: *al-Siyādat al-‘Arabiyyah* pg. 76

and the system of Persian kingdom or rule is quite evident. This view is supported by the fact that that most Persians are Shī'ah and the first Shī'ah were from Persia.¹

Thirdly, after the Muslims conquered the Persian lands, Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī عليه السلام married the daughter of Yazdegerd — one of the kings of Persia — after she was brought into the lands of Muslims along with all the other captives. 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn was born out of this wedlock. Thus the Persians now had seen in their offspring, who were born out of Ḥusayn's عليه السلام wedlock, heirs to their previous kingdom. They believed that the blood that flowed in the veins of 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn عليه السلام and his progeny was Iranian (Persian) blood (due the daughter of Yazdegerd who was his mother) and he was from the progeny of the Sassanid and thus divine kings (according to their belief).² Added to that, the name Fāṭimah (as stated by some) is a revered name among the Persians, as there was a Fāṭimah, according to Persian history, whose achievements were praiseworthy.³

Fourthly, there are some narrations in the books of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah which have a Persian flavour to them. According to them, Salmān عليه السلام — who was exonerated by Allah from their blasphemous beliefs — had a few specialities and qualities which raised him above the sphere of being a normal human. Their narrations state:

1 Muḥammad Abū Zahrah: *Tārīkh al-Madhāhib al-Islāmiyyah* 1/38

2 For more information regarding the fact that the mother of 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn was the daughter of Yazdegerd, refer to *Tārīkh al-Ya'qūbi* 2/247, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfi* 1/53. To understand the effects thereof, refer to Samīrah al-Laythī: *al-Zandaqah wa l-Shu'ūbiyyah* pg. 56, 'Abd Allāh al-Gharīb: *Wa Jā'a Dowr al-Majūs* pg. 77, al-Nashshār: *Nash'at al-Fikr al-Falsafi* 2/111, 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Ḥiṣān: *al-Mahdī wa l-Mahdawiyyah* pg. 82, Donaldson DM: */This Shi'ite Religion* pg. 101

3 She helped out greatly — as they believe — in exposing the fire-worshipper Samardays, who took over the throne of the Kayānīn. Thus Fāṭimah was brave and consequently sanctified. If it was not for, the matters of this Smardays, the fire-worshipper would have remained unknown. If it was not for her, her father Otans and his companions would not be able to conspire against him. Refer to 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Ḥiṣān/*al-Mahdī wa l-Mahdawiyyah* pg. 84, on the authority of Herodotus (2/462), al-Maqdisī: *al-Bad' wa l-Tārīkh* 4/134, 6/95

ان سلمان باب الله فى الارض من عرفه كان مؤمنا و من انكره كان كافرا

Salmān is the door of Allah upon the Earth. Whoever recognises him is a believer and whoever does not recognise him is a kāfir.¹

This description of Salmān رضي الله عنه is repeatedly found in their narrations regarding their twelve Imams. Similarly, their narrations state:

يبعث الله اليه ماكا ينقر فى اذنه يقول كيت كيت

Allah sends an angel to him who whispers into his ears saying such and such...²

Ḥasan ibn Manṣūr reports:

I asked al-Ṣādiq, “was Salmān divinely inspired?” and he replied, “yes.” I asked, “who conveys to him the inspiration?” He replied, “an honourable angel.” Thereafter, I asked, “if Salmān is of this status, then what is the status of his companion?” He replied, “mind your own business.”³

This narration establishes that Salmān received revelation. It also implies that his companion, ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was level above that as well! Their narrations establish that Salmān رضي الله عنه was blessed with the knowledge of the ambiyā’ and Imams. It states:

سلمان ادرك علم الاول والاخر

Salmān had the knowledge of the first and the last.

The narration then goes on to explain this:

يعنى علم النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم و علم على و امر النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم و امر على

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 15

2 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 16

3 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 19

i.e. the knowledge of Nabī ﷺ and ‘Alī and the matters of Nabī ﷺ and ‘Alī.¹

It is also stated in their narrations that Salmān is one of those Shī‘ah (as the falsely claim) by means of whom:

ترزقون و بهم تنصرون و بهم تمطرون

You are given sustenance, helped and because of whom you are granted rain.²

Some of the Shī‘ah were not satisfied with this degree of extremism. Hence they took it even further by claiming that Salmān was a deity. This sect was found in the era of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī (d. 330 A.H). He indicates towards them in his book, *Maqālāt*, by saying:

Some people have said, in this era, that Salmān al-Fārsī was a deity.³

The narrations of this type which appear in the books of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah could be from the effects of this group. This is because the books of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah are an all-inclusive collection of the absurdities of all the different sects of the Shī‘ah. However, the fact that these narrations have been preserved warns us that this group could resurface at some point in the future.

In this day and age, we have witnessed, among the inner circles of the Shī‘ah an attitude of honouring a Persian personality, who participated in conspiring against the Khilāfah Rāshidah (the rightly guided khulafā’, viz. Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān and ‘Alī رضي الله عنه), i.e. Abū Lu’lu’ah, the Persian fire-worshipper who assassinated ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رضي الله عنه. He is granted the honourable title of *Bābā Shujāḥ al-Dīn*⁴, by them. The date of the murder of ‘Umar رضي الله عنه, at the hands

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 16

2 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 6-7

3 *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/80

4 ‘Abbās al-Qummī: *al-Kunnā wa l-Alqāb* 2/55

of this fire-worshipper is celebrated as one of their ʿĪds. Their scholar, al-Jazāʾirī quoted many narrations regarding this.¹ Furthermore, they honour the Day of Nayrūz, just as the fire-worshippers do,² whereas their narrations clearly state that the Day of Nayrūz is the ʿĪd of the Persians.³

The View that Shīʿism is the Home of Old Asian Beliefs

Some believe that Shīʿism is the home and habitat of old Asian beliefs such as Buddhism and others.⁴ Aḥmad Amīn says:

Under the banner of Shīʿism, views such as *Tanāsukh al-Arwāḥ* (transmigration of souls)⁵, believing in *Tajsīm* (Anthropomorphism), *Ḥulūl* (that the Almighty may embody another person) and other similar beliefs which were common among the Brahmins⁶, philosophers and Zoroastrians⁷ before it entered the Islamic world.⁸

1 *Al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah* 1/108

2 *Al-Aʿlāmī: Muqtabas al-Athar* 29/202-203, al-Majlisī: *Biḥār al-Anwār*, Bāb ʿAmal Yawm al-Nayrūz 98/419, *Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah* Bāb Istiḥbā Ṣawm Yawm al-Nayrūz wa l-Ghusl fīh wa Lubs Anṣaf al-Thiyāb wa l-Ṭīb 7/246

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 48/108

4 *Tārīkh al-Madhāhib al-Islāmiyyah* by Abū Zahrah 1/37

5 The transference of the soul, after death, from one body to another, whether it is the body of a human or an animal. This view was held by some Hindus and Pythagoras of Greece and thereafter found its way into the Muslim world. Refer to *al-Muʿjam al-Falsafī* pg. 55, *al-Taʾrīfāt* by al-Jurjānī pg. 93

6 They are those who affiliate themselves with a man from them named Braham. *al-Milal wa l-Niḥal* 2/251, or Birhām, who was one of the kings of Persia. *Al-Munyat wa l-Amal* pg. 72, They believe in Allah but disbelieve in the ambiyāʾ. They have different sects among them. Refer to the above-mentioned references.

7 Besides worshipping fire, they also believe that everything is based upon two principles; light and darkness. Light, according to them, always existed, whilst darkness came about later. The laws of the Zoroastrians also revolve around two principles; i.e. explaining the reason why light mixes with darkness and explaining the reason why it is free from darkness. Mixing of the two is considered the beginning and freedom of light is the end-point. *Al-Milal wa l-Niḥal* 1/232, al-Rāzī: *Iʿtiqādāt Firq al-Muslimīn wa l-Mushrikīn* pg. 134 Akhbār Umam al-Majūs: *al-Kasandar Sībīl*

8 *Fajr al-Islam* pg. 277

One of the orientalist pointed out that many un-Islamic beliefs were embraced by the Shī'ah. He states:

Those beliefs were adopted from Zoroastrianism, Maniasm¹, Buddhism and other religions which were popular in Asia even before the appearance of Islam.²

The author of *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* says:

The religion of the Shī'ah has exact resemblances with Judaism, Christianity, polytheism and Zoroastrianism.

Thereafter he mentions the reasons behind their resemblance with each group.³ A very accurate statement was made by the person who said that after studying the different sects of the Shī'ah, he found that Shī'ism contained all those beliefs against which Islam waged war.⁴

The Preferred View Regarding the Origin of Shī'ism

I am of the view that simply claiming that 'Alī عليه السلام was divinely appointed as the khalīfah is not necessarily something that has foreign roots. Love for the Ahl al-Bayt is natural (for Muslims). This love itself, does not demand that any difference is made between the different members of the Ahl al-Bayt, extremism is adopted as far as their love is concerned, or any of the Ṣaḥābah should be bad-mouthed — as is the practice of those who claim Shī'ism.

1 Maniasm: The followers of Mānī ibn Fātik who was a Zoroastrian by origin, and thereafter formed a religion between fire-worship and Christianity. The Zoroastrians opposed him and tried to kill him, until eventually he was killed by Bahrām ibn Hurmuz ibn Sābūr, after the era of 'Īsā عليه السلام. His religion remained among his followers. They also believe in the two principles; light and darkness. They believe that the universe was formed from these two, and that light is greater than darkness. It is the praiseworthy deity. Refer to *al-Milal wa l-Niḥal* 1/244 onwards, *al-Munyat wa l-Amal* pg. 60, *Sharḥ al-Taḥāwīyyah* pg. 18, *al-Rāzī: I'tiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn wa l-Mushrikīn* pg. 128

2 Vloten: *al-Siyādat al-'Arabiyyah* pg. 83-84

3 *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* pg. 298

4 Barakāt 'Abd al-Fattāh: *al-Waḥdāniyyah* pg. 125

Love for the Ahl al-Bayt increased and intensified after the calamities and trials that they were put through, starting from the assassination of ‘Alī عليه السلام, thereafter his son Ḥusayn عليه السلام and so on. These incidents ripped open the emotions of the Muslims. The ideologies of Ibn Saba’ did not find fertile grounds to flourish and spread except after the occurrence of these tragedies.

However, Shī’ism in the form of set beliefs such as the divine appointment of ‘Alī عليه السلام¹, Raj‘ah, Badā, Ghaybah, ‘Iṣmah, etc., there is no doubt that these beliefs were brought into the ummah and they unlawfully entered the ranks of the Muslims. Their roots can be traced back to many different nations, as whoever had any malice and hatred for Islam and the Muslims jumped onto the bandwagon of Shī’ism.

Shī’ism was also a safe haven for all those who wished to remain upon their beliefs (whether they were Jews, Christians, Zoroastrian or followers of any other set of beliefs) and still be referred to as Muslims. The outcome of all of this was Shī’ism became a conglomeration of foreign doctrines which forced their way into it. This will be explained under the in-depth study of their principles. Ibn Taymiyyah accurately stated that those who claim to be adherents of Shī’ism composed their religion from the beliefs of the Persians, Romans, Greeks, Christians, Jews and others. They added all of these to Shī’ism. Thereafter, he says that this is the realisation of the information passed on to us by Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم, that this ummah will follow in the footsteps of the people before them, and he quotes the relative aḥādīth. He says that this the exact condition of the Shī’ah.²

The Sects of the Shī’ah

The books regarding sects are filled with the names of the different sects and groups of the Shī’ah. What draws our attention is the amount of sects that they

1 This is unlike the first case, where a mere claim is made and it is not linked in any way to a person’s beliefs and it has no effect upon his status as a Muslim.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/147, read the aḥādīth regarding this in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, Kitāb al-‘iṭisām bī l-Sunnah, Bāb Qawl al-Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم Latattabi’anna Sunan Man Kān Qablakum number 2669, *al-Musnad* 2/450, 511, 527

have amongst them. Perhaps no other religion in the world has that amount of sects. It is their outstanding trait, or rather calamity. After the death of each of their Imāms, a new set of sects emerged, and each sect had a unique methodology by which they would appoint the next Imām. Similarly, each sect would invent a unique set of beliefs and thereafter claim that they alone were on the correct path.

This difference of opinion was something that the Shī'ah themselves complained and grumbled about. One of the Shī'ah asked his Imām, as quoted by *Rijāl al-Kashshī*:

جعلنى الله فداك ما هذا الاختلاف الذى بين شيعتكم؟ فقال واى اختلاف؟ فقال انى لاجلس فى حلقتهم بالكوفة فاكاد اشك فى اختلافهم فى حديثهم فقال ابى عبد الله اجل هو كما ذكرت ان الناس اواعو بالكذب علينا وانى احدث احدهم بالحديث فلا يخرج من عندى حتى يتاوله على غير تاويله وذلك انهم لا يطلبون بحديثنا وحبنا ما عند الله و انما يطلبون الدنيا و كل يحب ان يدعى راسا

“May Allah allow me to be sacrificed for you! What is all this differences in your Shī'ah?” He asked, “what differences?” The questioner replied, “I sit in their study circles in Kūfah, which makes me doubt regarding the differences in their aḥādīth.” Abū 'Abd Allāh (al-ṣādiq) replied, “yes, it is as you have stated. The act of lying against us has been imbued into people. I say a ḥadīth to one of them, but he does not leave my presence until he interprets it against its interpretation. That is because they do not seek by means of our ḥadīth and love for us the reward of Allah. Their only goal is worldly wealth and each one dreams of being made a leader.”¹

This narration spells out to us that love for leadership and the wealth of this temporary world was the motive behind many Shī'ah embracing Shī'ism, as well as the fact that lying and fabricating against the Ahl al-Bayt was their passion. This was the reason behind their differences and splintering. Al-Mas'ūdī² (al-

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 135-136, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 2/246

2 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn 'Alī al-Mas'ūdī, the historian. Ibn Ḥajar says: “His books make it clear that he was a Shī'ī Mu'tazilī. The Twelvers classify him — in their books on biographies — as one of their scholars. He died in the year 436 A.H.” Refer to Ibn Ḥajar: *Lisān al-Mizān* 4/224, Ibn Shākir al-Kutbī: *Fawāt al-Wafayāt* 3/12, 'Abbās al-Qummī: *al-Kunnā wa l-Alqāb* 3/160, al-Ardabīlī: *Jāmī' al-Ruwāt* 1/574

Shī'ah¹, and each group declares the next group disbelievers. It is for this reason that the Rāfiḍī Mīr Bāqir al-Dāmād² assumed that the ḥadīth which states that the ummah will split up into seventy three different sects³ refers to the sects of the Shī'ah, and the one that will be granted salvation is the Imāmiyyah.⁴

1 *Murūj al-Dhahāb* 3/221, also refer to al-Rāzī: *I'tiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn* pg. 85

2 Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad al-Istarbādī, famously known as Dāmād. He was among the scholars of the Shī'ah during the reign of the Ṣafawids (d. 1040). His biography can be found in *al-Kunnā wa l-Alqāb* 2/206, al-Muḥibbī: *Khulāṣat al-Athar* pg. 301, al-Ḥakīmī: *Tārīkh al-'Ulamā* pg. 83

3 The ḥadīth about the ummah splitting into seventy-three sects is as stated by Ibn Taymiyyah: "A Mashhūr (one level below mutawātir) and authentic ḥadīth which appears in the Sunan and Masānīd." (*al-Fatāwā* 3/345, gathered by 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Qāsim). "There are so many narrations of the ḥadīth regarding the splitting of the ummah into seventy-three sects that no doubt can remain regarding the meaning thereof." (*al-'Ilm al-Shāmikh* pg. 414).

It should be noted that this ḥadīth has been narrated without mentioning that any of them will be doomed. This version has been reported by most of the ḥadīth scholars including the authors of *Sunan* books (besides al-Nasā'ī). Other versions mention that one will attain salvation and the rest will be doomed. This is not reported by any of the authors of *Sunan* books besides Abū Dāwūd in *Kitāb al-Sunnah* (number 4573). It is also reported in *Al-Dāramī* 2/241, *Aḥmad* 4/102, *Ḥākim* 1/128 and al-Ājurri reports it in *al-Sharīah* pg. 18.

There is also a narration which states that all the sects will attain salvation besides one, i.e. the irreligious sect. The 'ulamā have classified this narration as a fabrication. Refer to *Kashfal-Khafā* 1/369, *Al-Asrār al-Marfū'ah* pg. 161.

Just as the Ahl al-Sunnah have reported this ḥadīth, the Shī'ah have also done so. The wording reported by them is: "My ummah will split into seventy two groups, from which seventy one groups will be doomed and one will attain salvation." They asked, "who will that group be, O Rasūlullāh?" He replied, "the majority, the majority, the majority!" Another narration states: "My ummah will split up into seventy three sects after me. One sect from them will attain salvation and seventy two will be in hell." Refer to Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī: *al-Khiṣāl* 2/584-585.

There is no clear mention in these narrations that all these sects will be from the Shī'ah. Added to that, it is unambiguously stated that the sect that will attain salvation is the majority (not the Shī'ah)!

4 Jamāl al-Dīn al-Afghānī: *al-Ta'līqāt 'Alā Sharḥ al-Dawwānī li l-'Aqā'id al-Aḍudiyyah* (inside the book *Kitāb al-A'māl al-Kāmilah* by al-Afghānī, researched by Muḥammad 'Amārah 1/215). Rashīd Riḍā attributed this book to Muḥammad 'Abduh (*Tafsīr al-Manār* 8/221). However Muḥammad 'Amārah's research explains that it was the book of al-Afghānī. Refer to Muḥammad 'Amārah: *al-A'māl al-Kāmilah li l-Afghānī* 1/155-156, *al-A'māl al-Kāmilah* by Muḥammad 'Abduh 1/209.

As for the Ahl al-Sunnah, the Mu'tazilah and others, they are regarded by him to be part of those who need an invitation towards Islam. He believes that they did not yet accept the call towards Islam, and have not entered into it. This view was expressed by earlier Shī'ah as well. Al-Shahrastānī¹ and al-Rāzī² have indicated towards this. *Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif* states:

It has become apparent from the subsidiary laws of the Shī'ah that there are more sects than the seventy three famous ones.³ Al-Maqrīzī mentions that they have reached three hundred.⁴

The basis of their differences, in most cases, is account of their differences regarding the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt. They have many different opinions regarding the appointment of Imāms, their numbers and whether Imāmah should end with one of the Imams or it should be passed on to the next person and whether he should be made an Imam. This is besides their differences in subsidiary laws and fights regarding the interpretations of aḥādīth.

Al-ʿAllāmah Ibn Khaldūn, after stating their differences regarding the appointment of Imāms:

This type of difference of opinion proves that there was no divine appointment.⁵

This means that their claim that Rasūlullāh ﷺ himself appointed ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and the other Imāms is definitely baseless. This conclusion is based upon the fact that if the appointment was divine, there would be no differences and disagreements, especially to the extent that was found amongst them. Since there is a high degree of differences, we are forced to believe that there was no divine appointment. Allah سبحانه وتعالى says:

1 *Al-Milal wa l-Niḥal* 1/165

2 Al-Rāzī: *I'tiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn* pg. 85

3 *Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-Islāmiyyah* 14/67

4 *Al-Khuṭaṭ* 2/351

5 Ibn Khaldūn: *Lubāb al-Muḥaṣṣal* pg. 130

وَلَوْ كَانَ مِنْ عِنْدِ غَيْرِ اللَّهِ لَوَجَدُوا فِيهِ اخْتِلَافًا كَثِيرًا

If it had been from [any] other than Allah, they would have found within it much contradiction.¹

It is imperative to remember that Imāmah is the building block and foundation of Shī'ism. Thus, differences of opinion regarding it cannot be tolerated, as is tolerated in subsidiary matters. The leading scholar of the Zaydiyyah in his era, Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā al-Murtaḍā² (d. 840 A.H), considered the differences that arose at the death of each Imām and the appointment of the next Imām as the strongest and clearest proof which exposes the falsity of the claim that the Imams were divinely appointed.³

When we look at the books regarding sects, or other books which have mentioned the different sects of the Shī'ah, we find that they had such differences in their principles that on account of it they split up into many types of different sects. Al-Jāḥiẓ believes that there are only two types of Shī'ah; Zaydiyyah and Rāfiḍah. He says:

اعلم رحمك الله ان الشيعة رجلان زيدى ورافضى وبقيتهم بدد لا نظام لهم

Know well, may Allah have mercy upon you, that the Shī'ah are only two types; the Zaydis and the Rāfiḍīs. The rest of them are unsettled, they have no order.⁴

This classification is accepted by the leading scholar of the Shī'ah, al-Mufīd who

1 Sūrah al-Nisā: 82

2 He was among the greatest scholars of the Zaydiyyah, to the extent that his books on jurisprudence were highly appreciated by the Zaydiyyah of Yemen and those who affiliate themselves with the Ahl al-Bayt. Refer to al-Showkānī: *al-Badr al-Ṭālī* 1/122

3 *Al-Munyat wa l-Amal* pg. 21

4 *Thalāth Rasā'il li l-Jāḥiẓ* (published by al-Sindūbī) pg. 241, or *Rasā'il al-Jāḥiẓ, Risalāt Istiḥqāq al-Imāmah* pg. 207 (researched by 'Abd al-Salām Hārūn)

says that there are only two (types of) persons among the Shī'ah; the Imāmī and the Zaydī.¹

Imām al-Ash'arī رحمه الله believes that there were primarily three sects; the Ghāliyah, the Rāfiḍah (Imāmiyyah) and the Zaydiyyah. According to his count, the total amount of sects of the Shī'ah were forty-five. Fifteen sects belonged to the Ghāliyah, twenty-four to the Rāfiḍah and six to the Zaydiyyah.² The Ithnā 'Ashariyyah are considered by him as one of the sects of the Rāfiḍah (Imāmiyyah), and he names them *al-Qaṭī'iyyah*. He states that they are the majority of the Shī'ah.³

Many of the authors of books regarding sects have followed in the footsteps of al-Ash'arī as far as regarding them to be, in essence, three sects. Al-Rāzī, al-Isfarāyīnī, Ibn al-Murtaḍā and Ibn Taymiyyah are examples of the many scholars who did so.⁴ Al-Rāzī names them saying, the Zaydiyyah, the Imāmiyyah and the Kaysāniyyah.⁵ Ibn al-Murtaḍā says, “the Shī'ah are three sects; the Zaydiyyah, Imāmiyyah and Bāṭiniyyah.”⁶ Ibn Taymiyyah categorised them placing each one on a different level, the worst of them being the *Ghāliyah* (who believe that 'Alī رحمه الله was to some degree a deity or at least that he was a Nabī), followed by the Rāfiḍah, and the best of them being the Mufaḍḍilah among the Zaydiyyah and others (who grant precedence to 'Alī over Abū Bakr and 'Umar رحمه الله but believe that their khilāfah was valid and they were just. They do not dissociate themselves from them.⁷

1 *Al-Irshād* pg. 195

2 *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/66, 88, 140

3 *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/90

4 Refer to the statement of Zayn al-'Ābidīn ibn Yūsuf al-Askūbī wherein he says, “as for the Shī'ah, they are twenty two sects, three of whom are the roots of the rest, i.e. the Ghulāt, the Zaydiyyah and the Imāmiyyah.” *al-Radd 'alā al-Shī'ah*, page 9 of the manuscript.

5 *I'tiqād Firaq al-Muslimīn* pg. 77

6 *Al-Munyat wa l-Amal* pg. 20, *al-Maqdisī: al-Bad' wa l-Tārīkh* 5/125

7 Ibn Taymiyyah: *al-Tis'īniyyah* pg. 40 inside *Majmū' al-Fatāwā* vol. 5 printed in Kurdistan 1329 A.H.

‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī believes that there are four primary sects among the Shī‘ah; the Zaydiyyah, Imāmiyyah, Kaysāniyyah and the Ghulāt. He gives all of them the title of Rāfiḍah.¹ According to his count, there are twenty sects in total,² excluding the extremists.³ He includes the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah among the sects of the Imāmiyyah and he refers to them as the Qaṭī‘iyyah as well,⁴ even though he previously listed Qaṭī‘iyyah and the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah as two different sects of the Imāmiyyah,⁵ not as one sect.⁶

As for al-Shahrastānī, he is of the view that the Shī‘ah were divided into many different sects. He says, “they have many differences and views regarding their counts of the Imams. At each count and hesitation (to appoint the next Imām) a new book, a new sect and a further decline takes place.”⁷ However, he states that in principle, they are five sects; the Kaysāniyyah, Zaydiyyah, Imāmiyyah, Ghulāt and Ismā‘īliyyah.⁸

The author of *al-Ḥūr al-‘Ayn* sums up the many different sects into six main sects.⁹ Ibn Qutaybah counts them as eight.¹⁰ Abū al-Ḥasan al-Milṭī believes that the Shī‘ah have twelve (primary) sects. He refers to all of them as Rāfiḍah.¹¹ He is supported, as far as this view is concerned, by al-Saksakī in his book *al-Burhān fī*

1 *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg. 21

2 The extremists are twenty sects according to him. *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg. 232

3 *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg. 23

4 *Ibid* pg. 64

5 *Ibid* pg. 53

6 It is for this reason that Muḥy al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd points out that the manner in which al-Baghdādī’s list in *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq*, the Twelvers are a separate group from the Qaṭī‘iyyah (footnotes of *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/90). He did not realise that al-Baghdādī clearly stated that the Qaṭī‘iyyah and the Twelvers are one sect. *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg. 64

7 *Al-Milal wa l-Niḥal* 1/147

8 *Ibid* 1/147

9 *Al-Ḥūr al-‘Ayn* pg. 154

10 Ibn Qutaybah: *al-Ma‘ārif* pg. 622-623

11 *Al-Tanbīh wa l-Radd* pg. 18

Ma'rifat 'Aqā'id Ahl al-Adyān.¹ However, it is surprising to note that al-Milṭī refers to the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah as the Ismā'īliyyah.² Ibn al-Jowzī is of the view that the Shī'ah are twelve sects,³ and Imam al-Qurṭubī concurs with him regarding that.⁴

It is important to note that the Zaydiyyah — besides the Jārūdiyyah — should be excluded from the rest of the Shī'ah, if they are all being referred to as the Rāfiḍah. This is because the Jārūdiyyah have adopted the stance of the Rawāfiḍ. This is the same reason why the renowned scholar of the Shī'ah, al-Mufīd, considers them alone — in exclusion to the rest of the Zaydiyyah — to be Shī'ah. The rest of the sects are not regarded as Shī'ah, as the Jārūdiyyah alone share the same principles as that of Rafḍ.⁵

The books of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah on the subject of sects have adopted a different methodology in mentioning the sects. They list the sects of the Shī'ah in order of the Imāms, as they realised that the Shī'ah split up into many different sects at the death of each Imām. The count of the sects of Shī'ah in the book *al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq* of al-Qummī and *Firaq al-Shī'ah* of al-Nawbakhtī exceeds sixty. The Ithnā 'Ashariyyah have been counted by both of them among the fourteen or fifteen groups into which the Shī'ah split after the death of Ḥasan al-'Askarī (d. 260 A.H).⁶

As for the books on narrations, al-Kulaynī quotes a narration in *al-Kāfī* in which it is stated that there are thirteen sects of the Shī'ah and all of them, with the

1 *Al-Burhān* pg. 36

2 *Al-Tanbih wa l-Radd* pg. 32-33

3 *Talbīs Iblīs* pg. 32 (researched by Khayr al-Dīn 'Alī)

4 *Bayān al-Firaq*, page 1 of the manuscript

5 Refer to al-Mufīd: *Awā'il al-Maqālāt* pg. 39. Read up on the Jārūdiyyah on page 58 of this booklet. Footnote 1.

6 Refer to al-Nawbakhtī: *Firaq al-Shī'ah* pg. 96 where he mentions that the companions of Ḥasan al-'Askarī who split up into fourteen sects after his death. Al-Qummī states that they split up into fifteen groups. Refer to al-Qummī: *al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq* pg. 102.

exception of one, will be in hell.¹ With all the above being mentioned, studying the inception of Shī'ism and the constant metamorphosis that it underwent requires a separate research and discussion, which would be a study of their History. So, we will not digress by stating all of their details.

Nonetheless, as will be noticed when the ideas and doctrines will be presented, the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah have upheld most of the ideas and doctrines that the other sects have concocted. They are the river into which all the streams and lakes flow. A study of this matter (which would require studying the narrations of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah and comparing them with the views of the other sects) would also demand a separate discussion. I have indicated to some of these reasons in this chapter of my thesis that I wrote for my masters.²

Thus, these sects have not ceased to exist, as is commonly believed. Most of them have survived. They remain in our midst, courtesy of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah school of thought. Present-day Shī'ah can be categorised into three groups:³

1. The Ithnā 'Ashariyyah
2. The Ismā'īliyyah⁴

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* (which is printed at the bottom of *Mir'āt al-'Uqūl*) 4/344. Al-Majlisī, according to their so-called classification methodology, classified this narration to be Ḥasan (reliable). *Mir'āt al-'Uqūl* 4/344

2 *Fikrat al-Taqrīb Bayn Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Shī'ah* pg. 346

3 Al-Nashshār: *Nash'at al-Fikr al-Falsafī* 2/12, al-'Āmilī: *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1/22, Muḥammad Mahdī Shams al-Dīn: *Niẓām al-Ḥukm wa l-Idārah fī l-Islam* pg. 61, Hibat al-Dīn al-Shahrastānī: *Muqaddimat Firaq al-Shī'ah*

4 They believe that the Imam after Ja'far al-Ṣādiq is Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far and thereafter Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far. The Imāmah of the rest of the progeny of Ja'far is rejected by them. Other groups sprouted out from the Ismā'īliyyah such as the Qarāmiṭah, Hashshāshis, Fātimids and the Druze. The Ismā'īliyyah have many different sects and names which differ from place to place. They have, as al-Shahrastānī states, "a new claim in every era and a new doctrine in every language." As for their religion, al-Ghazālī (among others) states, "it is a religion which is outwardly Rafḍ and in reality nothing but plain kufr." Ibn al-Jowzī states, "the crux of their beliefs is the denial of a creator, belittling nubuwwah and denying the hereafter. However, they do not disclose this at the first encounter. They have different levels in their invitation (to their beliefs). *continued.....*

3. and the Zaydiyyah¹

continued from page 124

The reality of the religion is not told to anyone, unless he reaches the highest level. Many of the scholars have learnt the reality of their matters and thereafter exposed them. Al-Baghdādī came across their book, *al-Siyāsāt wa l-Balāgh al-Akyad wa l-Nāmūs al-Akbar*. He realised therefrom that they are atheists and irreligious people who hide behind the veil of Shī'ism. Al-Ḥamādī al-Yamānī got to live amongst them, through which he realised their condition. He explained this in his book *Kashf Asrār al-Bāṭiniyyah*. Ibn al-Nadīm found their *al-Balāghāt al-Sab'ah* (the seven messages), and he read the seventh message. To his surprise, he found it to be a legalisation of illegal and forbidden acts, as well as a mockery of the sharā'i' (plural of sharī'ah) and the ones upon whom they were revealed as well as others. They are still active today. They keep their books a secret amongst themselves. One of them stated, 'we have books which are not available to anyone for reading except us and none will learn their realities besides us.'" Muṣṭafā Ghālīb" *al-Ḥarakāt al-Bāṭiniyyah fī l-Islam* pg. 67, Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī *al-Isimā'īlī: al-Zīnah* pg. 287 (inside the book *al-Ghuluw wa l-Firaq al-Ghāliyah*), al-Ghazālī: *Faḍā'ih al-Bāṭiniyyah* pg. 37 onwards, *al-Milal wa l-Niḥāl* 1/167, 19, al-Baghdādī: *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg. 294, 621, Ibn al-Nadīm: *al-Fahrist* pg. 267-268, al-Milṭī: *al-Tanbīh wa l-Radd* pg. 218, al-Maqdisī: *al-Bad' wa l-Tārīkh* 5/124, al-Isfarāyīnī: *al-Tabṣīr fī l-Dīn*, Ibn al-Jowzī: *Talbīs Iblīs* pg. 99, *al-Isimā'īliyyah: Iḥsān ilāhī Ḥāḥir*.

1. The Zaydiyyah are the supporters of Zayd ibn 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, *al-Milal wa l-Niḥāl* 1/154, *Muqaddimat al-Baḥr al-Zakhkhār* pg. 40. They have been named Zaydiyyah due to their affiliation with him. Yaḥyā ibn Ḥamzah: *al-Risālat al-Wāzī'ah* pg. 28, al-Sam'ānī/*al-Ansāb* 6/340. They detached themselves from the Imāmiyyah when Zayd عليه السلام was asked regarding Abū Bakr and 'Umar عليه السلام, whereupon he said: "May Allah be pleased with them." Those who disliked this and denounced him due to it were then named Rāfiḍah. Those who did not denounce him were named Zaydiyyah, on account of them following him. This took place towards the end of the reign of Hishām ibn 'Abd al-Malik (in the year 21/22 A.H) *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/21, *al-Risālat al-Wā'izah* pg. 87-88. The Zaydiyyah and the Mu'tazilah share the same beliefs. *al-Milal wa l-Niḥāl* 1/162, al-Muqbilī: *al-'Ilm al-Shāmikh* pg. 319, al-Rāzī: *al-Muḥaṣṣal* pg. 247. There are different sects among the Zaydiyyah as well. Some have no affiliation with Zayd except his name. They are in reality Rawāfiḍ. They claim that the ummah deviated and committed kufr by directing the khilāfah towards someone other than 'Alī عليه السلام. They are referred to as the Jarūdiyyah, the followers of Abū al-Jārūd (as was explained). Another group from them hold beliefs that are almost the same as that of the Ahl al-Sunnah. They are the followers of Ḥasan ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn Ḥayy al-Faqīh. They believe that Imāmah should be restricted to the progeny of 'Alī عليه السلام (Ibn Ḥazm says that the actual belief that has been established from Ḥasan ibn Ṣāliḥ is that Imāmah is restricted to the Quraysh). They associate themselves with all the Ṣaḥābah, but they believe in the superiority of 'Alī عليه السلام over the rest. Ibn Ḥazm: *al-Fiṣal* 2/266. For more information regarding the fair stance of the real Zaydiyyah as far as the subject of Ṣaḥābah is concerned, refer to Ibn al-Wazīr: *al-Rowd al-Bāsim* pg. 49-50, al-Muqbilī: *al-'Ilm al-Shāmikh* pg. 326. Also refer to my discussion regarding the Zaydiyyah in *Fikrat al-Taqrīb* pg. 146.

The Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah are the largest of all the groups in today’s time, just as they would represent the majority of the Shī‘ah at different points in history.

Some of the scholars who wrote regarding sects have referred to them as the “majority of the Shī‘ah”. Among them is al-Ash‘arī¹, al-Mas‘ūdī², ‘Abd al-Jabbār al-Hamdānī³, Ibn Ḥazm⁴ and Nishwān al-Ḥimyarī⁵. However, they were not always the majority. As an example, Ibn Khaldūn relates that the Shī‘ah of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah were the largest (group from the) Shī‘ah of the Ahl al-Bayt⁶ (i.e. in their era). Thereafter, the followers began abandoning it until it disappeared. Similarly, al-Balkhī says, as quoted by the author of *al-Ḥurr al-‘Ayn*, that the Faṭḥīyyah⁷ were the largest group of the Ja‘fariyyah and they had the largest gatherings (i.e. in his era).⁸

1 *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/90

2 *Murūj al-Dhahab* 4/199

3 *Al-Mughnī* vol. 2 category two pg. 176

4 *Al-Fiṣal* 5/38, 4/158

5 *Al-Ḥūr al-‘Ayn* pg. 166

6 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 3/172

7 They are the followers of “‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣādiq, the eldest of al-Ṣādiq’s children. They were named al-Faṭḥīyyah because ‘Abd Allāh had a large head (aṭṭāḥ al-ra’s in Arabic). They are also named al-‘Ammāriyyah, as one of their leaders was known as ‘Ammār. Al-Nawbakhtī says that most of the scholars and jurists of the Shī‘ah had inclined towards this group. However, ‘Abd Allāh lived for a mere seventy days after the demise of his father, due to which they retracted their view that he was an Imam. Refer to *Masā’il al-Imāmah* pg. 46, *Firaq a-Shī‘ah* by al-Nawbakhtī pg. 77-78, *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/102, *Al-Ḥūr al-‘Ayn* pg. 163-164.

The author of *al-Zīnah* (Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī al-Ismā‘īlī (d. 322 A.H)) says: “This sect has ceased to exist, as none hold this view anymore. ‘Abd Allāh passed away seventy days after the demise of his father and he did not leave behind any male children.” *Al-Zīnah* pg. 287. Perhaps this is the reason why they have ceased to exist. The narrations of the followers of this group have been preserved in the reliable books of the Twelvers as will appear under the chapter of the Sunnah.

8 *Al-Ḥūr al-‘Ayn* pg. 164

The Titles of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah Shī‘ah’s

Some of the titles by which the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyahs are referred to by authors of books on sects are:

Al-Shī‘ah:

The title Shī‘ah is used to refer to all the sects thereof. However, in this era, this title refers only to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah when used in its general sense, according to them and others including Strothmann,¹ al-Ṭabarsī,² Amīr ‘Alī,³ Kāshif al-Ghiṭā,⁴ Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-‘Āmilī⁵ and ‘Irfān ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd⁶. I am also of the opinion that it refers only to them. However, I say so, not only on account of them being the largest sect from the Shī‘ah, but on account of another reason as well, which holds more weight (although I have not seen anyone who studied and explained it whereas a discussion concerning it requires an independent study which should include a comparison along with an analysis), i.e. the books of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah on ḥadīth and narrations have covered the views of most, if not all, of the sects that emerged along the course of history (as explained previously). Thus, this sect has become the guardian of the other sects.

1 *Dā‘irat al-Ma‘ārif al-Islāmiyyah* 14/68

2 *Mustadrak al-Wasā’il* 3/311

3 Amīr ‘Alī says: “The (word) Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah has become a synonym of the (word) Shī‘ah.” *Rūḥ al-Islām* 2/92

4 He says: “Today, when it is used in its general sense, it refers specifically to the Imāmiyyah.” The word Imāmiyyah here is used to refer to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah, as will be seen from that which appears after this sentence. *Aṣl al-Shī‘ah wa Uṣūluḥā* pg. 92

5 Al-‘Āmilī says: “Since the Zaydiyyah and Imāmiyyah are only known by these affiliations, and the Faṭḥiyyah and Wāqifiyyah do not exist in this era, the name Shī‘ah is now confined to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah.” *Al-Shī‘ah fī l-Tārīkh* pg. 43.

6 ‘Irfān says: “When the word Shī‘ah is used without being specified or singling out (any sect), then only the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah are being referred to.” *Majallat Kullīyyat al-Dirāsāt al-Islāmiyyah*, edition 1 pg. 35-1387 A.H.

For more examples of scholars who held this view, refer to al-Sāmūrā’ī: *al-Ghulū wa l-Firaq al-Ghāliyah* pg. 82, Aḥmad Zakī Tufāḥāh: *Uṣūl al-Dīn wa Furū‘ih ‘Ind al-Shī‘ah* pg. 21 and Iḥsān Ilāhī Ḥāhīr: *al-Shī‘ah wa l-Tashayyu’* pg. 9

Al-Imāmiyyah

According to many of the authors of books regarding sects, this title is used for many different sects of the Shī'ah. However, according to latter day authors as well as others, it is confined to the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah. Perhaps the first person to hold this view was the leading scholar of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah in his era, al-Mufīd, in his book *Awā'il al-Maqālāt*.¹ Al-Sam'ānī indicated that this was the common practise of his time. He says:

Nowadays the title al-Imāmiyyah is used for this sect (referring to the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah).²

Ibn Khaldūn stated:

As for the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah, their latter day scholars have referred to them specifically, using the title al-Imāmiyyah.³

The author of *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* has indicated that the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah are the first sect that comes to mind when using the title Imāmiyyah.⁴ Shaykh Zāhid al-Kowtharī says, "it is common knowledge that the Imāmiyyah are the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah."⁵ Kāshif al-Ghiṭā is among the contemporary Shī'ī scholars who uses the title Imāmiyyah with reference to the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah.⁶ Some Shī'ī scholars who belong to the other sects are of the opinion that the Imāmiyyah consist of different sects, including the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah; the Kaysāniyyah, the Zaydiyyah and the Ismā'īliyyah.⁷ After understanding that the title Imāmiyyah is one of the many titles of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah, we will now move on to that which has been said regarding its definition:

1 *Awā'il al-Maqālāt* pg. 44

2 *Al-Ansāb* 1/344, Ibn al-Athīr: *al-Lubāb* 1/84, al-Sūyūṭī: *Lubb al-Albāb fī Taḥrīr al-Ansāb*/the alphabet Ḥamzah, the word Imāmiyyah.

3 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 1/201

4 *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* pg. 20

5 Al-Kowtharī: in his footnotes on the book *al-Tanbīh wa l-Radd of al-Milṭī*, pg. 18

6 *Aṣl al-Shī'ah wa Uṣūluḥā* pg. 92

7 Muḥsin al-Amīn: *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1/21

The scholar of the Shī'ah in his era, al-Mufīd says:

الامامية هم القائلون بوجوب الامامة والعصمة و وجوب النص و انما حصل لهم هذا الاسم فى الاصل
لجمعها فى المقالة هذه الاصول فكل من جمعها فهو امامى و ان ضم اليها حقاً فى المذهب كان او باطلا
ثم ان من شمله هذا الاسم و استحققه لمعناه قد افترقت كلمتهم فى اعيان الائمة و فى فروع ترجع الى هذه
الاصول و غير ذلك فاول من شذ من فرق الامامية الكيسانية

The Imāmiyyah are those who believe in the compulsion of Imāmah, infallibility and the incumbency of divine appointment. They were only given this title on account of them holding onto all of the above principles. Whoever upholds all of them will be an Imāmī, even though he adds on to them in the madh-hab. This is irrespective of whether he adds on truth or falsehood. In addition, those to whom this title is applicable and they are truly deserving thereof due to adhering to it, have differed regarding the (appointment of the different) Imāms, secondary matters which are based upon these principles as well as other matters. The first sect to separate from the rest of the Imāmiyyah was the Kaysāniyyah.¹

Here, we see al-Mufīd granting the title of Imāmiyyah to all those who uphold the three principles; Imāmah, infallibility and divine appointment. However, in another book of his, he places such pre-requisites to qualify for this title, that it is as if he wishes to confine it to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. He says:

الامامية علم على من دان بوجوب الامامة و وجودها فى كل زمان و اوجب النص الجلى و العصمة
والكمال لكل امام ثم حصر الامامة ولد الحسين بن على و ساقها الى الرضا على بن موسى عليه السلام

Al-Imāmiyyah is the title given to all those who accepts the incumbency of Imāmah, its existence in every era, believes that it takes place by explicit divine appointment (revelation), confines it to the progeny of Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī. (Thereafter he lists all the Imāms until al-Riḍā, ‘Alī ibn Mūsā).²

1 Al-‘Uyūn wa l-Maḥāsīn 2/91

2 Awā’il al-Maḳālāt pg. 44

This definition states that a person has to believe that the divine appointment was explicit, whereas he previously omitted this condition, as to include the belief that it was explicit as well as the belief that it was inexplicit. Similarly, here, he added on the condition that the Imāms should be from the progeny of Ḥusayn and he listed all of them until al-Riḍā ‘Alī ibn Mūsā, which he did not do in his first definition — the result of which was that it included the Kaysāniyyah. It seems as if he realised the contradiction between his two views. Thus he says:

لانه وان كان (اي لقب الامامية) في الاصل علما على من دان من الاصول بما ذكرناه دون التخصيص
لمن قال في الاعيان بما وصفناه فانه قد انتقل عن اصله لاستحقاق فرق من معتقديه القابا باحاديث لهم
باقاويل احدثوها فغلبت عليهم في الاستعمال دون الوصف بالامامية و صار هذا الاسم في عرف المتكلمين
و غيرهم من الفقهاء و العامة علما على من ذكرناه

This is because, even though it (the title Imāmiyyah) was originally coined to point out all those who accept the principles that we have mentioned, without confining it to those who believe regarding the Imāms that which we have explained, it is now used against its original meaning since some sects deserved other titles on account of their beliefs, aḥādīth and views which they invented. Thus, it became the norm to refer to them using these titles, instead of ‘Imāmiyyah’. Consequently, this title was used to identify those who subscribe to all the beliefs that we had mentioned.¹

If we look beyond that which al-Mufīd had stated and page through the other books regarding sects, to get an idea of the definition of ‘Imāmiyyah’ according to non-Shī‘ahs, we will see that most of the authors regarding the subject of sects have not confined the title of Imāmiyyah to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. Imāmiyyah, according to them was much more general and inclusive. Al-Shahrastānī says:

The Imāmiyyah are those who believe in the Imāmah of ‘Alī عليه السلام, and that he was appointed through explicit (revealed) texts. It was a specific and definite appointment of him, not a description which was suggestive of him. He was appointed in person.²

1 Ibid pg. 44

2 Al-Milal wa l-Niḥal 1/162

Al-Ash‘arī’s view is no different:

They are referred to as al-Imāmiyyah as they believe that ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib was divinely appointed.¹

Among the authors on the subject, is an author who opined that they were named al-Imāmiyyah on account of their belief that the world will never be void of an Imām, either he will come out in public and be known, or he will be hidden and described to people.² However, Ibn al-Murtaḍā says:

و الامامية سميت بذلك لجعلها امور الدين كلها للامام و انه كالنبي و لا يخلو وقت من امام يحتاج اليه
فى امر الدين و الدنيا

The Imāmiyyah have been given their name on account of them placing all the matters of dīn in the hands of the Imām, as if he is a Nabī. No era can be devoid of an Imām, he is needed for religious as well as worldly matters.³

In a nutshell, some believed that the title was given to them on account of their belief in divine appointment, some believed that it was a result of their belief that the earth will never be devoid of an Imām and others believed that it was also on account of their belief that all the matters of religion are in the hands of the Imām. All of these views are inter-connected and boil down to the same thing.

The title, Imāmiyyah, came to the fore after the title, Shī‘ah. Apparently, it became popular after the Shī‘ah started paying more attention and granting importance to the doctrine of Imāmah and the Imām, and after some sects sprung up who singled out certain individuals of the Ahl al-Bayt as Imāms. The entire discussion will appear under the subject of Imāmah. Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd states that the views of the Imāmiyyah (not even their title) only became famous in the later eras. He says:

1 *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/86

2 ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-‘Irāqī: *Dhikr al-Firaq al-Ḍawāl* (manuscript). Al-Qurṭubī has the same view in his book *Bayān al-Firaq* (manuscript). Refer to *Sharḥ al-Ithnatayn wa l-Sab‘īn* (manuscript).

3 *Al-Munyat wa l-Amal* pg. 21

لم تكن مقالة الامامية و من نحا نحوهم من الطاعنين فى امامة السلف مشهورة حينئذ (يعنى فى العصر الاموى) على هذا النحو من الاشتهار

The views of the Imāmiyyah and those who adopt their path, i.e. criticising the Imāmah of the salaf¹ was not as famous in that era (the era of the Omayyads) as it is now.²

Al-Ithnā al-‘Ashariyyah

This term is not found in the classical books regarding sects. Al-Qummī (d. 299/301 A.H) did not mention it in his book *al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq*, al-Nawbakhtī (d. 310 A.H.) did not mention it in his book *Firaq al-Shī‘ah* and al-Ash‘arī (d. 330 A.H) did not mention it in his book *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*. Perhaps, the first person to mention it (from the Shī‘ah) was al-Mas‘ūdī³ (349 A.H). As for non-Shī‘ahs, ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī (d. 429 A.H) was most likely the first to mention it as he says, “they were named the ‘Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah’ due to their claim that the awaited Imām belonged to the twelfth generation from the progeny of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه”⁴

Muḥammad Jawād Mughniyyah, a contemporary Rāfiḍī says:

الاثنا عشرية نعت يطلق على الشيعة الامامية القائلة باثني عشر اماما تعينهم باسمائهم

Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah is an adjective used to describe the Shī‘ah Imāmiyyah who believe that there are twelve Imāms and they specify them by their names.⁵

This name or title undoubtedly only made its appearance after the demise of Ḥasan al-‘Askarī (d. 260 A.H.), “prior to his demise none held the view that their

1 Literally pious predecessors. In this context, those who preceded, viz. ‘Alī, Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.

2 *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* 4/522

3 *Al-Tanbih wa l-Ishrāf* pg. 198

4 *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg. 64

5 *Al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah wa Ahl al-Bayt* pg. 15

twelfth Imām will be the awaited one. Added to that, there is no proof, from the era of ‘Alī عليه السلام as well as the entire reign of the Banū Umayyah, that anyone claimed that there will be twelve Imams.”¹ However, the author of *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah* is of the view that the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah appeared in the year 255 A.H.²

It seems as if he stipulated this date based on his own calculations. This is because that was the year in which the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah claimed that their Twelfth Imām³ had been given birth to (regarding whom they believe that he is alive until today and they are awaiting his appearance). If the matter should be left to calculations, then it would be more appropriate to stipulate the year 260 A.H., as the claim of the existence of the twelfth and awaited Imām only came to the fore after the demise of Ḥasan al-‘Askarī (who passed away in the year 260 A.H.).

As for the twelve Imāms who the Ja‘fariyyah take as their Imāms, they are ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn and the progeny of Ḥusayn عليه السلام.

To follow is a list of the names, titles, agnomens, birthdates and dates of death of each Imām.

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/209

2 *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* pg. 21

3 As stated by al-Kulaynī: *al-Kāfī* 1/514, al-Mufīd: *Al-Irshād* pg. 390, al-Ṭabarsī: *A’lām al-Warā* pg. 393. The year 256 A.H is stipulated in *al-A’lām of al-Ziriklī* (2/215), *al-‘Aql ‘ind al-Shī‘ah* of Rushdī ‘Ilyān (pg. 56), *Tārīkh al-Imāmiyyah* of ‘Abd Allāh Fayyāḍ (pg. 183).

	Name of the Imām	His Agnomen	His Title	His Dates of Birth and Death
1	‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib	Abū al-Ḥasan	Al-Murtaḍā	23 (Before Hijrah)-40 A.H.
2	Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī	Abū Muḥammad	Al-Zakī	2 A.H.-50 A.H.
3	Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī	Abū ‘Abd Allāh	Al-Shahīd	3 A.H.-61 A.H.
4	‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn	Abū Muḥammad	Zayn al-‘Abidīn	38 A.H.-95 A.H.
5	Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī	Abū Ja‘far	Al-Bāqir	57 A.H.-114 A.H.
6	Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad	Abū ‘Abd Allāh	Al-Ṣādiq	83 A.H.-148 A.H.
7	Mūsā ibn Ja‘far	Abū Ibrāhīm	Al-Kāzim	128 A.H.-183 A.H.
8	‘Alī ibn Mūsā	Abū al-Ḥasan	Al-Riḍā	148 A.H.-203 A.H.
9	Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī	Abū Ja‘far	Al-Jawwād	195 A.H.-220 A.H.
10	‘Alī ibn Muḥammad	Abū al-Ḥasan	Al-Hādī	212 A.H.-254 A.H.
11	Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī	Abū Muḥammad	Al-‘Askarī	232 A.H.-260 A.H.
12	Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan	Abū al-Qāsim	Al-Mahdī	They claim that he was born in the year 255/256 A.H and he is alive until today. ¹

¹ For more information regarding the Imāmiyyah, refer to al-Kulaynī: *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/452, al-Mufīd: *Al-Irshād*, al-Ṭabarī: *Ālām al-Warā*, Al-Arbalī: *Kashf al-Ghummah*. Also refer to al-Ash‘arī: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 90-91, al-Shahrastānī: *al-Mīlāl wa l-Niḥāl* 1/169, Ibn Khaldūn: *Lubāb al-Muḥaṣṣal* pg.

128 as well as other books.

Al-Qaṭ'iyyah

It is one of the titles of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah according to some of the authors on the subject of sects such as al-Ash'arī¹, al-Shahrastānī², al-Isfarāyīnī³ and others.⁴ They were named al-Qaṭ'iyyah as they were certain that Mūsā ibn Ja'far (al-Ṣādiq)⁵ had passed away. This is the view of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah. Al-Mas'ūdī says:

و في سنة ستين و مائتين قبض ابو محمد الحسن بن علي... وهو ابو المهدي المنتظر الامام الثاني عشر
عند القطيعية من الامامية

In the year 260, Abū Muḥammad Ḥasan ibn 'Alī passed away... He is the father of the awaited Mahdī, the twelfth Imām, according to the Qaṭ'iyyah Imāmiyyah.⁶

Some of them consider the word Qaṭ'iyyah to be a name of one of the sects of the Imāmiyyah, and not one of the titles of the Imāmiyyah.⁷

1 *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 90-91

2 *al-Milal wa l-Niḥāl* 1/169

3 *Al-Tabṣīr fī l-Dīn* pg. 33

4 *Al-Ḥūr al-'Ayn* pg. 166

5 Al-Qummī: *al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq* pg. 89, *al-Nāshī al-Akbar*, *Masā'il al-Imāmah* pg. 47, al-Ash'arī: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/90, 'Abd al-Jabbār al-Hamdānī: *al-Mughnī* vol. 20 category 2, pg. 176, al-Mas'ūdī: *Murūj al-Dhahab* 3/221

6 *Murūj al-Dhahab* 4/199

7 *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfat al-Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* pg. 19-20. There is no doubt that the Qaṭ'iyyah were the predecessors of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah. They were given this name after they expressed certainty regarding the death of Mūsā. This led to their separation from the Ismā'īliyyah. However, when we look at the fact that the Shī'ah split up at the death of each Imām, we realise that this separation was the lot of the Qaṭ'iyyah... Further sects were formed from them, who did not believe in twelve Imāms. Thus, they were no longer part of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah. Therefore, the term Qaṭ'iyyah is not restricted to the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah.

Aṣḥāb al-Intizār

Al-Rāzī grants this title to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah since they believe that the Imām after Ḥasan al-‘Askarī is his son Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-‘Askarī who is in occultation and will soon emerge. He says, “this is the madh-hab of the Imāmiyyah of our times.”¹ There are other sects as well, not only the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah, who are anticipating the emergence of the Imām. However, they have differences among themselves as to who exactly is the Imām.

Al-Rāfiḍah

Some scholars (such as al-Ash‘arī in *al-Maqālāt*² and Ibn Ḥazm in *al-Fiṣal*³) have used the word Rāfiḍah to refer to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. The books of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah admit in very clear words, that this is one of their titles. Their scholar, al-Majlisī (in his book *Al-Biḥār* — which is one of their eight canonical works on ḥadīth), quotes four of their narrations in which they are extolled for being named Rāfiḍah.⁴ It is as if they tried to lull their masses by beautifying this name. However, even these narrations reveal that people began referring to them in this way to insult them and not to praise them.

1 *I’tiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn wa l-Mushrikīn* pg. 84-85

2 Refer to *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/88

3 *Al-Fiṣal* 4/157-158

4 Al-Majlisī mentions them under the chapter titled, “the virtue of the Rāfiḍah and the praiseworthiness of being named so”. An example of the narrations in this chapter is:

Reported from Abū Baṣīr, I said to Abū Ja’far (al-Bāqir), “May I be sacrificed for you, we have been given a name by which the authorities have taken as a license to spill our blood, take our wealth and punish us!” He asked, “what is that name?” I replied, “al-Rāfiḍah.” Thereupon Abū Ja’far said, “there were seventy men from the army of Mūsā عليه السلام who were the most hard-working and had the greatest love for Hārūn. Thereupon, the nation of Mūsā named them al-Rāfiḍah. Allah then revealed to Mūsā, ‘place this as their name in the Torah as I have granted it to them.’ Allah has granted that name to you (as well).” *Al-Biḥār* 68/96-97, *Tafsīr Furāt* pg. 139, *al-Barqī: al-Maḥāsīn* pg. 157, *al-A’lamī: Dā’irat al-Ma’ārif* 18/200

These Shīʿī sources do not cite the reasons behind them becoming the targets of this derogatory term and insult.¹ Nevertheless, other sources have explained that this is on account of their stances regarding the khilāfah of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما. Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī states:

They were only given the name Rāfiḍah on account of them denouncing the khilāfah of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما.²

Ibn Taymiyyah quoted this statement of al-Ash‘arī and thereafter commented, “the correct view is that they were named al-Rāfiḍah after they abandoned Zayd ibn ‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, when he left Kūfah during the reign of Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik.”³ However, this view of Ibn Taymiyyah boils down to that which al-Ash‘arī stated. This is because they only denounced Zayd when he openly declared⁴ his view regarding Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما and their khilāfah.⁵

1 There is a claim that the first person to name them Rāfiḍah was al-Mughīrah ibn Sa‘īd, the leader of the al-Mughīriyyah sect. He was killed by Khālīd al-Qisrī in the year 119 A.H. This was due to him inclining towards the Imāmah of al-Nafs al-Zakiyyah (Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ḥasan) after the demise of Muḥammad al-Bāqir, and he proclaimed this view. Thereupon the Shī‘ah of Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad denounced him. Consequently, he named them al-Rāfiḍah. Refer to al-Qummī: *al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq* pg. 76-77, al-Nawbakhtī: *Firaq al-Shī‘ah* pg. 62-63, al-Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār: *al-Mughnī* vol. 20 category 2 pg. 179. This view seems to be a product of the works of the Rawāfiḍ. Al-Ṭabarī pointed this out saying, “These days they claim that they were named al-Rāfiḍah by al-Mughīrah, when they separated from him.” *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* (7/181). ‘Abd Allāh al-Fayyād considers the ḥadīth that is attributed to al-Mughīrah, wherein he names the Shī‘ah “al-Rāfiḍah”, to be so unreliable that it does not even deserve to be scrutinised. One way in which this is proven is that, if he was the one who named them so, it would not have been a derogatory term and the authorities would not have taken it as a license to spill their blood, take their wealth and punish them, as they claim in their narrations. *Tārīkh al-Imāmiyyah* pg. 75

2 *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/89. For more information regarding them being named al-Rāfiḍah, refer to al-Shahrastānī: *al-Milāl wa l-Nihāl* 1/155, al-Rāzī: *l-tiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn wa l-Mushrikīn* pg. 77, al-Isfarāyīnī: *al-Tabṣīr fī l-Dīn* pg. 34, al-Jilānī: *al-Ghunyah* 1/76, Ibn al-Murtaḍā: *al-Munyat wa l-Amal* pg. 21.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/130

4 This should not create the impression that any of the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt had a different view regarding Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما, as they too revered these illustrious personalities. However, what gives greater merit to the denunciation of the Shī‘ah by Zayd رضي الله عنه was that he openly declared this reverence when they rallied around him and dissociated himself from those who reviled them, whereas the praise of the other Imāms for the illustrious Ṣaḥābah did not occur on the same scale as Zayd رضي الله عنه.

5 Refer to *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 7/180-181, Ibn al-Athīr: *al-Kāmil* 4/246, Ibn Kathīr: *al-Bidāyah wa l-Nihāyah* 9/329, Ibn al-‘Imād al-Ḥambalī: *Shadhrāt al-Dhahab* 1/157, *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 3/99.

Thus, the view that they abandoned Zayd or his madh-hab, according to me, is the same (as the view that they were named such on account of denouncing Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما). Nonetheless, Ibn Taymiyyah took into consideration the historical perspective when he commented on the view of al-Ash‘arī. Proof of this is that some of the sects of the Shī‘ah, such as the Saba’iyyah and others had already denounced the khilāfah of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما, even before their disagreement with Zayd, but they were not called Rāfiḍah. This title was only given to them after they publicly distanced themselves from Zayd, (due to his praise for Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما) who consequently named them al-Rāfiḍah.

Added to the above, there are other views regarding the reason why they were called al-Rāfiḍah.¹ Also, some authors on the subject of sects refer to all the groups of the Shī‘ah using the word ‘Rāfiḍah’.²

Al-Ja‘fariyyah

They Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah are also referred to as the Ja‘fariyyah, due to their claim that their sixth Imam is Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رضي الله عنه. It is a reference to all of them by naming just one Imām. Al-Kashshī reports that the (supposed) supporters of Ja‘far in Kūfah were named al-Ja‘fariyyah. This reached him whereupon he was angered and he said:

ان اصحاب جعفر منكم لقليل انما اصحاب جعفر من اشد ورعه وعمل لخالقه ورجا ثوابه فهو لاء اصحابي

Indeed there are almost no companions of Ja‘far amongst you. The companions of Ja‘far are only those whose scrupulousness is of a high

1 It is said that they were named al-Rāfiḍah because they did not help al-Nafs al-Zakiyyah. Ibn al-Murtaḍā: *al-Munyat wa l-Amal* pg. 21, footnote 1 page 111. It is also said that it was on account of them not having love for the Ṣaḥābah, ‘Alī al-Qārī: *Shamm al-‘Awāriḍ fī Dhamm al-Rawāfiḍ* pg. 254 (of the manuscript). Another reason that has been stated is that it is on account of them leaving the religion of Islam, al-Iskūbī: *al-Radd ‘Alā al-Shī‘ah* pg. 23 (manuscript). Refer to Muḥy al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd: footnotes of *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/89.

2 Such as al-Baghdādī in *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq*, al-Isfarāyīnī in *al-Tabṣīr fī l-Dīn*, al-Milṭī in *al-Tanbih wa l-Radd*, al-Saksakī in *al-Burhān fī ‘Aqā’id Ahl al-Adyān*, etc.

level, he acts only to please his Creator and he hopes for reward from Him.
These are my companions.¹

This indicates — if there is any truth to the narration — that the name al-Ja'fariyyah was common in the time of Ja'far, and he was not pleased with most of those who claimed affiliation with him. Similarly, it also points out that this name was shared between the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah and the Ismā'īlī, as the split between them only took place after the demise of Ja'far. The term al-Ja'fariyyah was also used in reference to a sect of the Shī'ah who are now non-existent. They held the view that the Imām after Ḥasan al-A'škari was his brother Ja'far.² There are also other names and titles that were given to the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah in different countries.³

Al-Khāṣṣah (the special ones)

This is a title used by the scholars of the Shī'ah to refer to their sect, and they refer to the Ahl al-Sunnah as the 'Āmmah (the common folk). The following appears in *Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-Shī'iyyah*:

الخاصة في اصطلاح بعض اهل الدراية: الامامية الاثنى عشرية والعامة اهل السنة و الجماعة

The term al-Khāṣṣah, according to some of the scholars refers to the Ithnā

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 255

2 Al-Rāzī: *I'tiqādāt Firqat al-Muslimīn* pg. 84, *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* pg. 21

3 Such as 'al-Mutawīlah'. This was used in the latter days to refer to the Shī'ah of Mount 'Āmil, Ba'albakk and Mount Libnān. It is the plural form of the word Mutawālī, which is one form of the verb *tawālā* (from *al-walā* and *al-muwālāt*) which means love. This was on account of their claim that they loved the Ahl al-Bayt. It is also said that they were given this name because they would say, at the time of war, "Mit waliyyan li'Alī" (die whilst supporting 'Alī). Thus they were each name mutawālī. Refer to *Ḥādīr al-'Ālam al-Islāmī* 1/193-194, *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1/22. Another title is 'Qizilbash' — a Turkish word which means, the one with a red head — nowadays this name is popular in Iran. Similarly, all the Shī'ah of India, Rome and Syria are referred to by this name. Refer to *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1/23-24. It will appear under the discussion of the sects of the Shī'ah that the Qizilbash are one of the sects of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah.

‘Ashariyyah, and the term al-‘Āmmah refers to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah.¹

These two terms are used quite extensively in their aḥādīth narrations. They say, “this is reported by the ‘Āmmah and this is reported by the Khāṣṣah.”²

The Sects of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah

The Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah are an offshoot of the Imāmiyyah (in its broader meaning), and one of its contingents. They are one of the fifteen groups that the Shī‘ah spilt up into after the demise of Ḥasan al-‘Askarī³ (260 A.H.). Added to that, many other sects were also formed within the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. Maḥmūd al-Mallāh, who carefully studied and follows the developments of this sect, says, “in this time of ours, we find the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah divided into (the following sects):

1. Uṣūliyyah
2. Akhbāriyyah
3. Shaykhiyyah⁴

1 *Dā‘irat al-Ma‘ārif* 17/122

2 As an example, refer to *Ghāyat al-Marām* of Hāshim al-Baḥrānī. Among their narrations is;

ما خالف العامة ففيه الرشاد

That in which is in opposition of the ‘Āmmah is guidance.

Refer to *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/68, *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 18/76.

3 Refer to al-Qummī: *Firaq al-Shī‘ah* pg. 102.

4 Al-Shaykhiyyah: they are also referred to as al-Aḥmadiyyah. They are the followers of Shaykh Aḥmad al-Iḥsā‘ī (who was born in the year 166 A.H. and died in the year 241 A.H.) He was among the scholars of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. Al-Ālūsī says regarding al-Iḥsā‘ī and his followers, “their speech indicates that they believe regarding ‘Alī (عليه السلام) that which the philosophers believe regarding the first intellect (universal reason, i.e. all creation emanated from it). The beliefs of ḥulūl, (incarnation: when the divine embodies the flesh of a human) taking the Imāms as deities and denying a physical resurrection have also been attributed to them. Among the foundations of their beliefs is the belief in the existence of a perfect man (who was given the form of Iḥsā‘ī).” The Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah Shī‘ah have differed greatly regarding him. *continued....*

4. Kashfiyyah¹

continued from page 140

Some, such as al-Khowansārī (in *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 1/94) have praised him while others, such as Muḥammad Maḥdī al-Qazwīnī (in his book *Zuhūr al-Ḥaḳīqah 'alā Firqat al-Shaykhiyyah*) have condemned him. A third group, including 'Alī al-Bilādī (in *Anwār al-Badarayn* pg. 408) preferred not to comment regarding him, whilst a fourth group decided to take the 'middle path' regarding him. Muḥammad Ḥusayn says:

اختلف الناس فيه بين من يقول بركنيته و بين من يقول بكفره و التوسط خير الامور والحق انه من اكابر علماء الامامية

People have differed regarding him. Among them are those who believe that he is the foundation of faith, and another group who believes that he was a disbeliever. However, the best of paths is moderation, and the truth is that he was from the senior scholars of the Imāmiyyah.

Thereafter he showers some praise upon him, and he goes on to say:

نعم له كلمات في مؤلفاته بجملة - كذا - متشابهة لا يجوز من اجلها التهميم والجرأة على تكفيره

Yes, he has some statements in his writings which are highly questionable. This does not make it permissible to attack him and be bold in declaring him a disbeliever. (Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā (the footnotes of *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* pg. 408-409).

This difference of opinion informs us that the blasphemous bunkum and deviation proclaimed by this man were taken lightly by many of the Shī'ah. For more information on the religion of the Shaykhiyyah, refer to al-Ālūsī: *Nahj al-Salāmah* pg. 18-19 (of the manuscript), *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* pg. 22, al-'Alamī al-Ḥā'irī: *Muqtabas al-Athar* 20/126, Muḥammad Ḥasan Āl al-Talaqānī: *al-Shaykhiyyah Nash'atuhā wa Taṭawwuruhā*, *Majallat al-'Irḥān* vol.22, pg. 199, A'yān al-Shī'ah 8/390, Muḥsin 'Abd al-Ḥamīd: *Ḥaḳīqat al-Bābiyyah wa l-Bahā'iyyah* pg. 34, Goldziher: *al-'Aqīdat wa l-Sharī'ah* pg. 270, Mubārak Ismā'īl: *al-Tayyārāt al-Fikriyyah* pg. 110

1 They are the followers of Kāzīm ibn Qāsim al-Rishtī (d. 1259 A.H.). He was the student of al-Iḥsā'ī (the founder of the Shaykhiyyah), and he succeeded him in his post after his death. He upheld the teaching of his teacher adding onto it a greater degree of extremism and fanaticism. They were named al-Kashfiyyah on account of the claim of their leader, that he received kashf and ilhām (divine inspiration). Al-Ālūsī says regarding them, "al-Kashfiyyah is a title which was given to them by one of the viziers of the viziers ('Alī Riḍā Pashā) may Allah elevate his ranks. They are the students of al-Sayyid Kāzīm al-Ḥusaynī al-Rishtī who is a student of al-Iḥsā'ī, and he graduated under him. However, he opposed him in certain matters. His speech was more severe and distasteful than that of his teachers, to the extent that the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah consider him to be from the extremists. He, on the other hand, exonerates himself from the apparent meanings of his statements. I have met him many times, but I did not see in him that which the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah scholars say, who declare him a disbeliever.

5. Rukniyyah¹

6. Karīmkhāniyyah²

7. Qizilbāshiyyah³

continued from page 141

Yes, the reality is that his views regarding the Imāms, the beginning of creation and the hereafter are different to theirs... I do not think that his differences with his teacher would be sufficient grounds to regard him and his followers a separate sect from the Shaykhiyyah.” *Nahj al-Salām* pg. 19. Other scholars have regarded his group to be a separate sect, on account of him explicitly saying this in his book *Dalīl al-Ḥayrān* pg. 136:

هذا مسلک لم یسبقنی الیه احد قبلی

This is a view which has not been expressed by anyone before me. (Refer to Āl Ṭa’ah: *Madīnat al-Ḥusayn* pg. 34)

It is for this reason that Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā says regarding him, “he is the one who strayed from the correct path and deviated greatly. He is the one who brought upon the Shī’ah Imāmiyyah the greatest trial and test. The calamity of al-Bābiyyah was given birth to by him and his followers, not his teacher al-Iḥsā’ī.” Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā: footnotes of *Anwār al-Badrayn* pg. 408-409. Further details regarding them can be found in Muṣṭafā ‘Imrān: *Tahāfut al-Bābiyyah* pg. 37-39, Āl Ṭu’mah: *Madīnat al-Ḥusayn* (this book contains a lengthy discussion regarding the Kashfiyyah from the books of their leader and his students pg. 24 onwards), ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ḥusaynī: *al-Bābiyyūn wa l-Bahā’iyyūn* pg. 10.

1 The followers of Mirzā Muḥammad Karīm ibn Ibrāhīm Khān al-Kirmānī. He is one of the students of al-Rishtī and he upheld his madh-hab. They were given their name as they believed in the fourth rukn (principle) and the perfect Shī’ī. They understood this to be from the foundational principles of the dīn and they believed that it took the form of their leader. Refer to Āl Ṭu’mah: *Madīnat al-Ḥusayn* pg. 56. Some scholars are of the view that Rukniyyah and Kashfiyyah are titles of the Shaykhiyyah and all of them are one and the same sect. Refer to *Majallat al-‘Irfān* vol. 33 pg. 199, Muḥammad Āl al-Ṭaliqānī: *al-Shaykhiyyah* pg. 274.

2 They are the followers of Muḥammad al-Fajrī al-Kirmānī Karīmkhān, who was upon the madh-hab of the Shaykhiyyah. This is why al-Ḥā’irī said regarding him, “the leader of the Shaykhiyyah.” *Muqtabas al-Athar* 24/274-275.

3 They are Shī’ah who follow the Safavid Sūfī order. The word Qizilbāsh means red head. They were given this name because they would cover their heads with a red uniform, i.e. a specific red hat which was their outstanding symbol. One of them describes it; “Ḥaydar ibn Junayd al-Ṣafawī ordered his followers don a distinctive twelve-gored crimson headwear indicating their adherence to the Twelve Imams.” Muḥsin al-Amīn claimed that Qizilbash was a title of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah in some countries (as stated earlier). He probably said this merely to hide the extent of division among the Shī’ah as well as their abundance of sects, as he usually does. Refer to Muṣṭafā al-Shībī: *al-Fikr al-Shī’ī* pg. 405-406, A’yān al-Shī’ah 1/23,24.

All of these sects belong to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. Their principles are spread out in the books of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. Despite this, they declare one another disbelievers.¹ Some researchers have added a few more names to this list, i.e. al-Qartiiyyah², al-Bābiyyah³ and al-Kowhariyyah⁴. Others have also added the Nūrbakhshiyyah⁵. Al-Ālūsī says, “it is not unlikely that more sects of the

1 *Al-Ārā’ al-Ṣarīḥah* pg. 81

2 The followers of a woman named Hind. Her agnomen was Umm Salamah, and her title wa Qurrat al-‘Ayn. This title was given to her by Kāẓim al-Rishtī in his correspondences with her as she was one of his followers. After his death, she followed al-Bāb, and thereafter opposed him in a few matters including the establishment of responsibility. It is said that she believed that all private parts were permissible and there was no responsibility. Al-Ālūsī (Abū al-Thanā) says: “I did not perceive any of that from her, even though she was imprisoned in my house for two months. According to my research, the Bābiyyah and Qartiiyyah are the same sect. They hold the same beliefs as the Kashfiyyah regarding the Imāms, and they believe that the responsibility of performing five ṣalāh has been terminated. They also believe that revelation has not come to an end.” *Naḥj al-Salāmah* pg. 21. Refer to Āl Ṭu‘mah: *Madīnat al-Ḥusayn* pg. 56, 239. Most of the books that have been authored regarding the Bābiyyah speak about this woman and her followers. Refer to the references that will be presented in the next footnote.

3 The followers of al-Bāb Mīrzā ‘Alī Muḥammad al-Shīrāzī (1235-1265). He was from the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah Imāmiyyah. He claimed to be the Bāb (door) of the Imām that they are waiting for. He alone speaks on behalf of him. Thereafter, he claimed that he is the (awaited) Imām. As if that was not enough, he further went on to claim that Allah — whose being is far too lofty to be affected by these types of nonsensical claims — embodied Himself into him. His kufr and deviation was of many different types. Refer to Muḥsin ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd: *Ḥaqīqat al-Bābiyyah wa l-Bahā’iyyah*, Muṣṭafā ‘Imrān: *Tahāfuat al-Bābiyyah wa l-Bahā’iyyah*, Maḥmūd al-Mallāḥ: *al-Bābiyyah wa l-Bahā’iyyah*, Iḥsān Ilāhī Ḥāḥir: *al-Bābiyyah*.

4 They are the followers of al-Ākhund Mullā Ḥasan Kowhhar, whose sect is promoted in Karbalā until today. (Āl Ṭu‘mah: *Madīnat al-Ḥusayn* pg. 55). The Kashfiyyah had a great effect in bringing them to the fore. Op. cit. pg. 239. They take the Imāms to be deities and thereafter say that it (this view) emancipates a sinner from the punishment of his sins. Ibid pg. 53-54

5 This is a reference to Muḥammad Nūrbakhsh al-Qohistānī whose agnomen was Abū al-Qāsim. He was born in the year 795 A.H. and he died in the year 869 A.H. The Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah claim that this sect is one of their sects. They are found in the valleys of Himalaya and Kohistan in Baltistān, which lies next to Tibet (China). He claimed that he is the Mahdī. His agnomen was on the pattern of his (al-Mahdī’s) name. He disbelieved in the Mahdi of the Shī‘ah and dissociated himself from them.

Imāmiyyah are still to emerge.” We ask Allah for protection.¹

Along the course of my search for the texts of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah, which they attribute to the Imāms and relate them in their reliable works, I found that it contains the seeds of many different sects and deviant desires. Every worshipper of his desires, extremist and innovator will find in there his objective and goals. It became voluminous due to the permissibility (or rather commendableness) of Taqiyyah (dissimulation), excessive fabrications against the Imams and the admittance of the irreligious and conspirators (against Islam, not Shī‘ism) among its ranks. The Shī‘ scholars were also unable to discern the original beliefs from that which was added on along the centuries, as they had no proper scale by which they could measure the correctness of any of the narration. These, among others, are the reasons why they include the seeds of almost every poisonous belief in their hideous narrations.

If we decide to present a comprehensive discussion regarding each sect independently, our discussion will lengthen to a great extent whereas it is not part of our actual subject. Our aim is to do a study regarding their roots, not the development of their sects, the details of the founders thereof, their views and ideas. We may suffice upon discussing the split of the Shī‘ah into Uṣūliyyah

continued from page 143

Due to this, some of them are of the opinion that he was not from the sects of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. Rather, they believe that he was from those Ṣūfiyyah who believed in Waḥdat al-Wujūd. Iḥsān Ilāhī Ḥāhīr: *al-Shī‘ah wa l-Tashayyū‘* pg. 316. However this does not prove that they were not part of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. His ideas were mostly from their school of thought, but he claimed to be the Mahdī and tried to fit the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah upon himself. He accepted the Twelve Imāms and that is why on the day in which he accepted the pledge of allegiance as the Mahdī, he sufficed upon accepting all twelve Imāms (using the number of the Imāms as a source of blessing). Al-Shībī: *al-Fikr al-Shī‘ī* pg. 332 Similarly, he visited the ‘sanctified Shī‘ shrines’ when he visited ‘Irāq. Al-Shībī: *al-Fikr al-Shī‘ī* pg. 333 As for his Sufī leanings, the Shī‘ah have often used Sufism as a springboard, tool and guise to trap the ignorant and unwary. For further reading regarding this sect, refer to *al-Shī‘ah wa l-Tashayyū‘* pg. 314, Muṣṭafā al-Shībī: *al-Fikr al-Shī‘ī* pg. 328.

1 Abū al-Thanā al-Ālūsī: *Nahj al-Salāmah* pg. 22

and Akhbāriyyah, as the Uṣūliyyah is the basis and foundation of the religion of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah, who make up the majority, and they are rivalled by the Akhbāriyyah — who are less than them in number.

The rest of the sects do not have the numbers and size that is possessed by the Uṣūliyyah. This is why we have sufficed upon brief definitions of each sect in the footnotes. As for the differences between the Uṣūliyyah and Akhbāriyyah, this affects the foundations of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah sect. It is a difference of opinion that divides the champions and compilers of the legacy of their madh-hab. Whilst al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī (author of *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah*), al-Kāshānī (author of *Al-Wāfi*), al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī (author *Mustadrak al-Wasā’il*) and most importantly, Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (who was considered the leader of the Akhbārīs¹) are all Akhbārīs and authors of the most authentic books of narrations according to them, they are opposed by al-Ṭūsī (author of *Al-Istibṣār* and *Al-Tahdhīb*) and al-Murtaḍā (to whom *Nahj al-Balāghah* is attributed — if not his brother) among other Uṣūlīs.

Thus, the differences between the Uṣūlīs and the Akhbārīs is a difference of opinion that exists between the flag-bearers and pillars of the madh-hab. Hence we cannot take a step further without defining these two sects:

The Akhbārīs: They do not allow *ijtihād* (deduction of laws from the sources of Islam), and they act upon their apparent meaning of narration. They believe that all the narrations which appear in the four books of the Shī’ah² are authentic and they were undoubtedly articulated by the Imams. They suffice upon the Qur’ān and their narrations. This is why they are called Akhbārīs, which is a reference to *akhbār* (narrations). They do not accept *ijmā’* (consensus) or the intellect as

1 Refer to *al-Uṣūliyyūn wa al-Akhbāriyyūn Firqat Wāḥidah* pg. 4 You will also notice that some Akhbārī scholars rose to fame amongst them such as Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā, the author of *Aṣl al-Shī’ah wa Uṣūluhā*. Some of the influential scholars of the Uṣūlīs, who make up the majority, are Muḥsin al-Ḥakīm, Sharīf al-Madārī, al-Khū‘ī, al-Khomeini, etc.

2 They are, *al-Kāfi*, *Al-Wāfi*, *Al-Istibṣār* and *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh*. Details regarding them will appear under the section, “Sunnah, according to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah”.

proofs.¹ They see no need to learn the principles of jurisprudence (*Uṣūl al-Fiqh*), rather they see it as incorrect.

The Uṣūlīs/Mujtahids: They believe in *ijtihād*. According to them, laws are established from the Qur’ān, Sunnah, *ijmā’* and the intellect. They do not accept that all the narrations in the four books are authentic. They are the majority.²

However, their scholar, al-Anṣārī reveals, as he quotes from their researcher Ghulām Riḍā al-Qummī, that the Akhbārīs rely solely upon the Shī’ī narrations, and accept them (even though they may contain flaws) without differentiating between the authentic and unacceptable narrations. He says:

و يعجبني في بيان وجه تسمية هذه الفرقة الاخباريين المرموقة بالاخبارية وهو احد الامرين:

الاول: كونهم عاملين بتمام الاقسام من الاخبار من الصحيح و الحسن و الموثق و الضعيف من غير ان يفرقوا بينها في مقام العمل في قبال المجتهدين
الثاني: انهم لما انكروا الادلة الثلاثة بما فيها القران الكريم و خصوا الدليل بالواحد منها اعنى الاخبار فلذلك سمو بالاسم المذكور

I wish to explain the reason behind the name of the sect Akhbāriyyah. They are referred to as Akhbāriyyah due to one of two reasons:

1. They practise upon all types of narrations — ṣaḥīḥ, ḥasan and ḍa’if³ — without distinguishing between them before practising upon them, as opposed to the Mujtahids.
2. Since they rejected the other three sources of proofs, including the Qur’ān, and confined it to only one (the narrations) they were given the above-mentioned name.⁴

1 Refer to *al-‘Aql ‘Ind al-Shī’ah al-Imāmiyyah* by Rushdī ‘Ilyān.

2 Refer to Ḥasan al-Amīn: *Dā’irat al-Ma’ārif*, pg. 107, ‘Izz al-Dīn Baḥr al-‘Ulūm: *al-Taqlīd fī l-Sharī’ah* pg. 92, Farj al-‘Imrān: *al-Uṣūliyyūn wa l-Akhbāriyyūn Firqat Wāḥidah* pg. 19

3 The explanation of these terms will appear under the chapter, “their view regarding the Sunnah”.

4 *Al-Qalā’id ‘alā l-Farā’id*, marginal notes of *Rasā’il al-Shaykh al-Anṣārī* (Mabḥath Ḥujjiyat al-Qaṭ’). Refer to *al-Taqlīd fī l-Sharī’at al-Islāmiyyah* pg. 93

A fact that deserves attention is that they bowed down to the fairy-tales in which it is mentioned that the Qur'ān is incomplete. Hence they discarded its proofs and preferred over it their fairy-tales. Due to this, they expelled themselves from the boundaries of Islam. However, despite this blatant kufr which they openly declared, many Shī'ī scholars have this to say regarding the differences between the Akhbārīs and Uṣūlīs:

يقتصر على بعض الوجوه البسيطة ككل خلاف يحدث بين أبناء الطائفة الواحدة تبعاً لاختلاف الرأى والنظر

It is confined to a few simple matters, just like any other difference of opinion which occurs between the adherents of a sect on account of the differences that exist between outlooks and intellects.¹

The author of *al-Uṣūliyyūn wa l-Akhbāriyyūn Firqat Wāḥidah* says:

انى بحسب تتبعى و فحصى كتب الاصوليين والخباريين لم اجد فرقا بين هتين الطائفتين الا فى بعض الامور التى لا توجب تشنعا و لا قدحا

According to the extensive research and studying that I have done of the books of the Uṣūlīs and Akhbārīs, I did not find a difference between these two sects except in some matters, which do not necessitate that either of them should be reproached or considered incorrect.²

Hence, are they two agents of the same mission?

One of the present day Shī'ah wished to trivialise the gravity of their view regarding practising upon the Qur'ān and rejecting the Qur'ān. He says:

كيف ينكرون الاخباريون و هم من المسلمين دليلية الكتاب

How is it possible that the Akhbārīs do not take the Qur'ān as a source of proof whereas they are from the Muslims?³

1 *Al-Taqlīd* pg. 92, *al-Baḥrānī: al-Ḥadā'iq* 1/169-170

2 Farj al-Imrān: *al-Uṣūliyyūn wa al-Akhbāriyyūn Firqat Wāḥidah* pg. 2-3

3 'Izz al-Dīn: *al-Taqlīd* pg. 93

Thereafter, he tries to find for them a crevice through which they can escape by quoting their scholar al-Astarabādī:

ان القرآن ورد على وجه التعمية بالنسبة الى اذهان الرعية

Indeed the (text of the) Qur'ān is quite general for the minds of the people.¹

Therefore, it is not permissible to act upon it, except according to the guidelines of their narrations.² Thus, in essence, both explanations lead to the same conclusion. This is because their narrations are an attempt at misinterpreting the meaning of the Qur'ān and turning it away from its actual implications, as will be explained. This applies to a greater extent to this sect, since they do not even believe in differentiating between the unreliable and so called authentic narrations.

Concerning the initial split of the Shī'ah into Akhbārīs and Uṣūlīs, al-Baḥrānī says regarding their scholar Muḥammad Amīn al-Astarabādī (d. 1033 A.H.):

هو اول من فتح باب الطعن على المجتهدين و تقسيم الفرقة... الى اخبارى و مجتهد

He is the first one who opened the door of criticising the Mujtahids and dividing the sect... into Akhbārīs and Mujtahids.³

Others claim that it was done previously, and al-Astarabādī simply revived the concept.⁴ Notwithstanding all of the above, there has been rebuttals, arguments, reproaching and declaration of kufr between these two sects — to the extent that each group believed it to be impermissible to perform ṣalāh behind the opposition.⁵ Among the scholars of the Akhbāriyyah were those who did not touch the writings of the Uṣūliyyah, fearing its impurity. They would only touch it using their clothes.⁶

1 *Al-Fawā'id al-Madaniyyah* pg. 47-48, *al-Taqlīd* pg. 94, *al-Ḥadā'iq* 1/169

2 *ibid*

3 *Lu'lu'at al-Baḥrayn* pg. 117

4 *Al-Uṣūliyyūn wa l-Akhbāriyyūn Firqat Wāḥidah* pg. 4

5 Refer to Muḥammad Jawād Mughniyah: *Ma'a 'Ulamā' al-Najaf* pg. 74

6 Muḥammad Āl al-Ṭaliqānī: *al-Shaykhiyyah* pg. 9

Al-Astarabādī (who was an Akhbārī) declared some of the Uṣūlīs to be kāfir and he also insinuated that they are destroying the dīn¹ (as he opines). Similarly, al-Kāshānī (who was also an Akhbārī and he authored one of the eight fundamental books, i.e. *Al-Wāfi*) attributed kufr to a number of their scholars.² He was taken to task by one³ of them as he had views which were similar to the (deviant) ṣūfīs and the philosophers, which necessitated kufr, for example, his belief in the idea of Waḥdat al-Wujūd.⁴ In this way, they keep declaring one another kāfir, an age-old tradition that their predecessors initiated. This can also be seen in many of their narrations, as will appear.⁵ Nevertheless, both of these sects belong to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah.

As for the essential differences between these two groups, their scholar, Kāshif al-Ghiṭā wrote a book titled, *al-Ḥaqq al-Mubīn fī Taṣwīb al-Mujtahidīn wa Takhṭī‘at al-Akhbāriyyīn*,⁶ in which he counted these differences to be eighty in number. Al-Baḥrānī tries to do away with these differences, so he brings them down to as little as eight⁷ or even less,⁸ as he believes that they open the door for criticising the scholars of both sects and make the Shī‘ah⁹ vulnerable to condemnation. However, he was beaten by his successor, Muḥsin al-Amīn, who tried getting away with the claim that they are no more than five in number.¹⁰ Then, a third stance

1 Lu‘lu‘at al-Baḥrayn: *al-Baḥrānī* pg. 118

2 Ibid pg. 121

3 This was Al-Baḥrānī. Refer to *Lu‘lu‘at al-Baḥrayn* pg. 121

4 A ṣūfī term, the apparent meaning of which is open blasphemy. It means that Allah is in everything. In other words, there is only one existing being, Allah. However, some scholars have stated that the correct interpretation thereof is that (the greatness of) Allah can be witnessed in everything. His is the only true and independent existence.

5 Under the discussion of occultation in this book.

6 This book was printed in Tehran in the year 1316 A.H. Refer to *Al-Dharī‘ah* 7/37-38

7 ‘Izz al-Dīn Baḥr al-‘Ulūm: *al-Taqlīd* pg. 95

8 In the book *al-Ḥadā‘iq*, “I did not find him establishing more than four differences.” Refer to *al-Ḥadā‘iq* 1/167.

9 *Al-Ḥadā‘iq* 1/167

10 *A‘yān al-Shī‘ah* 17/453-458

also existed, which was a stance in between the two, thus bringing the number to a total of forty-three,¹ forty² and twenty-nine.³

The minimising of the differences is achieved by claiming that some of the matters are inter-linked, claiming that a difference of opinion exists within the sect itself so the contrary view cannot represent the sect or the difference does not really exist. An example of the last case is the issue of *ijmā'*, which is established as a source of proof by the Uṣūlīs and rejected by the Akhbārīs. However, their scholar, al-Baḥrānī believes that this difference does not exist, as he states that even though the Uṣūlīs have listed it as one of the sources of proof in their books regarding the principles of jurisprudence, they have discarded it on a practical level in their books wherein proofs are mentioned. They have argued regarding its establishment, occurrence and whether the results thereof ever existed. Thus, the effects of it have been totally annihilated.⁴

The object of our discussion is not to get into all the matters in which they oppose one another,⁵ rather we only wish to point out the division of the Shī'ah themselves into two sects who oppose one another and disagree regarding the sources of proofs, to say the least — even though some have tried to sweep it

1 This is the view of their scholar 'Abd Allāh ibn Ṣālīḥ al-Baḥrānī as stated in his book *Munyat al-Mumārīsīn*, refer to *al-Ḥadā'iq* 1/167

2 This is the view of their scholar 'Abd Allāh al-Samāhijī. Refer to *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 1/36

3 This is the view of their scholar al-Khowansārī refer to *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 1/36.

4 *Al-Ḥadā'iq* 1/168

5 For details regarding these differences refer to *Muqtabas al-Athar of al-Ḥā'irī* 3/296, al-Khowansārī: *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 1/36, al-Baḥrānī: *al-Ḥadā'iq* 1/167, *al-Kashkūl* 2/386-389, Muḥammad Ṣādiq Baḥr al-'Ulūm: *Dalīl al-Qaḍā al-Sharī' Uṣūluḥū wa Furū'uhū* 3/22-26, Muḥsin al-Amīn: *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 17/453-458, 'Izz al-Dīn Baḥr al-'Ulūm: *al-Taqlīd* pg. 95, al-Gharīfī: *al-Ijtihād wa l-Fatwā* pg. 99. Some have said that the most important differences that exist between them are four in number: 1) The types of aḥādīth (ṣaḥīḥ, ḥasan, muwatḥthaq, ḍa'īf) which is established by the by the Uṣūlīs and rejected by the Akhbārīs. 2) Taqlīd, the Uṣūlīs do not accept that a dead person can be followed, whereas the Akhbārīs accept it. 3 & 4) *Ijmā'* and the intellect. The Uṣūlīs accept that they can be used after the Qur'ān and the Sunnah, but the Akhbārīs do not accept that. Refer to al-Gharīfī: *al-Ijtihād wa l-Fatwā* pg. 99

under the carpet. At this point, I wish to highlight that these differences which occurred between the two sects of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah have shed light upon many realities of their religion, as the veil of Taqiyyah was ripped to pieces by the assaults that took place during the attacks on each other. Had it not been for these differences, these realities would not have come to the fore.

A careful and thoughtful study of the differences between the two sects will definitely reveal many of the secrets of the religion.¹

1 Personally, I benefitted from the arguments between them under the chapter, “their view regarding the Sunnah” and the chapter of Ijmā’.

Section One

Their Beliefs Regarding the Sources of Islam

This section contains three chapters:

1. Chapter One – Their Beliefs Regarding the Book of Allah
2. Chapter Two – Their Beliefs Regarding the Sunnah
3. Chapter Three – Their Beliefs Regarding Ijmā‘

Chapter One

Their Beliefs Regarding the Glorious Qur’ān

In this chapter, if Allah wills, we will first include the statements of the Shī‘ah which expose their beliefs regarding the Book of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. We will first present their view regarding the Qur’ān as a source of proof and their opposition of the consensus of the ummah in this matter. They believe that the Qur’ān cannot be a proof, unless it is accompanied by one who keeps it in place (one of the twelve Imāms). They also believe that the knowledge of the Qur’ān is preserved only with the Imām. They were handpicked for its knowledge, and none besides them had access to it. Furthermore, they opine that he has the right to restrict the general command and add conditions to that which is stated without any conditions therein, etc.

Secondly, we will present their beliefs regarding the meaning of the Qur’ān. This will include their view that the Qur’ān has an inner meaning, which is only known by the Imāms as well as their view that most of the Qur’ān was revealed regarding them and their enemies. Thirdly, we will include their views regarding the text of the Qur’ān, and we will study whether or not the Shī‘ah believe that the Qur’ān is incomplete and was interpolated.

Added to the above, the Shī'ah believe that the Qur'an is a creation — an idea which they inherited from the Mu'tazilah. This matter will also be discussed under the chapter regarding their beliefs concerning the names of Allah and His attributes. Another claim of theirs, which repeatedly appears in their books although no one has analysed it or pointed it out, is that divine books are revealed to the Imāms. This matter was unclear to many, to the extent that I seen some researchers mistaking this to be the same as another view that is attributed to the Shī'ah, viz. the Qur'ān was interpolated. Among them was Goldhizer, Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb and Iḥsān Ilāhī Ṣāḥib.

The Shī'ah also uphold the belief that their Imāms possess all the books that were revealed upon the ambiyā'. We will look into this matter as well as the one prior to it under the discussion 'belief upon the Book' – which is one of the pillars of faith. The reason why I mentioned them here is so that a complete picture of their beliefs regarding the Book of Allah could be drawn (as this is easier when everything is mentioned in one place). However, these three matters have been discussed in the mentioned places, as they are more appropriate for the discussion.

All the above has been covered in this book, as I noticed (according to my own research) that those who countered Shī'ism did not give due attention to them. Our contemporary scholars have excessively discussed one subject, i.e. the view of interpolation of the Qur'ān, which is attributed to the Shī'ah. We will see that the discussions around this subject were not free from mistakes and generalisation of the view that is actually upheld by the extremist Shī'ah. We seek the help of Allah alone.

Discussion One

Their Belief Regarding the Qur'ān as a Source of Proof

This discussion will be divided into three sub-sections; Firstly, their claim that the Qur'ān cannot be used as a proof, unless it is accompanied with the opinion of the Imām. Secondly, the belief that the knowledge of the Qur'ān and its understanding is confined to the Imāms. Thirdly, the view that the Imām has the right to restrict the general commands of the Qur'ān and add conditions to those which were revealed without any conditions attached to them, etc.

a. The Qur'ān Cannot be a Proof Unless it is accompanied With the Opinion of the Imām

Along the course of my study of Shī'ī literature, I found that this matter was emphasised in a number of their relied upon works. I had never previously imagined that any sect which associates itself with Islam would dare say, “the Qur'ān cannot be used as a source of proof,” whereas Allah says regarding those who asked for a sign to prove the truthfulness of the Messenger ﷺ:

أَوَلَمْ يَكْفِهِمْ أَنَّا أَنْزَلْنَا عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ يُتْلَىٰ عَلَيْهِمْ ؕ

And is it not sufficient for them that We revealed to you the Book (i.e., the Qur'ān) which is recited to them?¹

Thus, the glorious Qur'ān is the sign, proof and evidence. However, the scholar of the Shī'ah, who they have dubbed *Thiqat al-Islām* (the reliable one of Islam), al-Kulaynī, reports in his book *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* (which the Shī'ah revere as much as the Ahl al-Sunnah revere *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*):

1 Sūrah al-'Ankabūt: 51

2 Refer to the chapter, “their beliefs regarding the Sunnah,” in this book.

ان القرآن لا يكون حجة الا بقيم...و ان عليا كان قيم القرآن و كانت طاعته مفترضة و كان الحجة على الناس بعد رسول الله

The Qur'ān cannot be a proof except with the Imām one who keeps it in place... 'Alī was the one who kept the Qur'ān in place. Obedience to him was compulsory upon the people, and he was the proof against the people, after Rasūlullāh.¹

This doctrine can be found in many of their seminal books such as *Rijāl al-Kashshī*², *ʿIlal al-Sharāʿi*³, *al-Maḥāsin*⁴, *Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah*,⁵ etc. What exactly do they mean by this statement? Does it mean that the text of the Qur'ān cannot be used as proof unless it is sanctioned or explained by the Imām? This would mean that the actual proof is not the word of al-Raḥmān, but rather the word the Imām! Or, do they mean that the Qur'ān will not be practised upon except if it is enforced by the sultan, and he is the one who keeps it in place by implementing it? This possibility is ruled out due another narration which complements the above narration. This narration states:

فنظرت في القرآن فإذا هو يخاصم به المرجئ و القدرى والزنديق الذى لا يؤمن به حتى يغلب الرجال
بخصومته فعرفت ان القرآن لا يكون حجة الا بقيم

I pondered over the Qur'ān. I found that the Murjī'ah, Qadariyyah and renegades who do not have faith; all use it to argue and defeat men with their arguments. Thereupon I realised that the Qur'ān cannot serve as proof unless it is accompanied by the Imām.⁶

This implies that the statements of the Imām are clearer than the speech of al-Raḥmān. It is also clear from the above that the actual proof is the statements of

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/188

2 *Al-Ṣadūq: ʿIlal al-Sharāʿi* pg. 192

3 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 420

4 *Al-Barqī: al-Maḥāsin* pg. 268

5 *Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah* 18/141

6 *Ibid*

the Imam as he alone has the ability of explaining it. Hence, they have referred to the Qur'ān as *al-Qur'ān al-Ṣāmit* (the silent Qur'ān) and the Imām as *al-Qur'ān al-Nāṭiq* (the talking Qur'ān). They even have a 'narration' from 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ wherein it is alleged that he said:

هذا كتاب الله الصامت و انا كتاب الله الناطق

This is the silent Book of Allah, and I am the Book of Allah who speaks.¹

Another narration goes:

ذلك القرآن فاستنطقوه فلن ينطق لكم اخبركم عنه

This is the Qur'ān. Ask it to speak, and it will never speak to you people. I will inform you about it.²

Their narrations also state:

و على تفسير كتاب الله

'Alī is the explanation of the Book of Allah.³

On other occasions, they claim that the Imāms are in fact the Qur'ān.⁴ Yet another

1 Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: *Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah* pg. 235

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/61

3 *Al-Biḥār* 37/209, al-Ṭabarsī: *al-Iḥtijāj* pg. 31-33, al-Barūjardī: *Tafsīr al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm* 20/30

4 This is why we find them misinterpreting the verse:

وَاتَّبِعُوا النُّورَ الَّذِي أُنْزِلَ مَعَهُ

...and followed the light which was sent down with him – (Sūrah al-A'rāf: 157).

They say, “‘light’ refers to ‘Alī and the Imāms عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام. (Thus, according to this, the Imāms were sent down from the heavens).’ *Al-Kāfī* 1/194. They also misinterpret the following verse:

وَإِذَا تُلِيَتْ عَلَيْهِمْ آيَاتُنَا بَيِّنَاتٍ قَالَ الَّذِينَ لَا يَرْجُونَ لِقَاءَنَا إِنِ هَٰذَا إِلَّا بَقْرَةٌ مِّنْ قَبْلِهِ ۖ أَتَىٰ هَٰذَا أَوْ بَدِّلَهُ ۖ قُلْ مَا يَكُونُ لِي أَن أُبَدِّلَهُ مِن تِلْقَائِي نَفْسِي ۖ إِنِّي أَخْبِئُ إِلَّا مَا يُؤْتِي إِلَيَّ ۚ

And when Our verses are recited to them as clear evidences, those who do not expect the meeting with Us say, “Bring us a Qur'ān other than this or change it.” Say, [O Muḥammad], “It is not for me to change it on my own accord. I only follow what is revealed to me. (Sūrah Yūnus: 15)

claim of theirs is that the Qur'ān was not explained to anyone besides 'Alī عليه السلام.¹ If any of the above makes any sense, what definitely does not make sense is how could 'Alī be the one who keeps the Qur'ān in its place if he himself was the Qur'ān? If he was the Qur'ān or the one who keeps it in place, then why was it explained to him? Similarly, how could it have been explained to him when he was the explanation? Undoubtedly, these views are a collection of contradictions, which were concocted by a disbeliever whose only intention was the corruption of the religion of the Muslims. Who else would have said this regarding the Book which was revealed by Allah as a means of guidance for the entire humanity? Allah says:

إِنَّ هَذَا الْقُرْآنَ يَهْدِي لِلَّتِي هِيَ أَقْوَمُ وَيُبَشِّرُ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ الَّذِينَ يَعْمَلُونَ الصَّالِحَاتِ أَنَّ لَهُمْ أَجْرًا كَبِيرًا

Indeed, this Qur'ān guides to that which is most suitable and gives good tidings to the believers who do righteous deeds that they will have a great reward.²

continued from page 157

They say, "Bring us a Qur'ān other than this or change it (i.e. Amīr al-Mu'minīn)." Refer to *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī* 2/120, *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/419, *Tafsīr al-Burhān* 2/180, *Tafsīr Nūr al-Thaqalayn* 2/296, *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/310, and *Biḥār al-Anwār* 80 /36.

A similar misinterpretation is seen in their explanation of the verse:

أَمْ يَقُولُونَ نَقُولُ ۖ بَلْ لَا يُؤْمِنُونَ ﴿٣٣﴾ فَلْيَأْتُوا بِحَدِيثٍ مِثْلِهِ إِنْ كَانُوا صَادِقِينَ

Or do they say, "he has made it up"? Rather, they do not believe. Then let them produce a statement like it, if they should be truthful. (Sūrah al-Ṭūr: 33-34)

Tafsīr al-Qummī states:

"He has made it up"? i.e. Amīr al-Mu'minīn. "Rather, they do not believe" (that he did not make it up and he did not place it on account of his own view.) Then let them produce a statement like it (a man like him from Allah), if they should be truthful.

Refer to *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/333, al-Baḥrānī: *al-Burhān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān* 4/242, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 36/85, etc.

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/250

2 Sūrah al-Isrā: 9

The rightly guided Khalīfah, ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه said:

كتاب الله فيه نبا ما قبلكم وحكم ما بينكم هو الفصل ليس بالهزل من تركه من جبار قصمه الله ومن ابتغى الهدى في غيره أضله الله وهو جبل الله المتين وهو الذكر الحكيم وهو الصراط المستقيم وهو الذى لا تزيف به الاهواء ولا تلبس به الالسن ولا تنقضى عجائبه ولا يشيع منه العلماء من قال به صدق ومن عمل به اجر ومن حكم به عدل ومن دعا اليه هدى الى صراط مستقيم

The Book of Allah contains historical anecdotes of the people before you and the law that you should apply among yourselves. It is the judge. It is not a means of amusement. Whoever discards it out of arrogance, Allah will destroy him and whoever looks to anything besides it for guidance, Allah will lead him astray. It is the Rope of Allah which will not ever snap, the reminder which is filled with wisdom and the straight path. Desires are not corrupted by it and tongues are not confused by its recital. It does not cease to amaze (the reader) and the scholars are never satiated by it (it always leaves them with a desire for more). Whoever speaks it or recites it says the absolute truth, whoever practices upon it, will be rewarded, whoever passes a judgement according to it, his judgement will be filled with justice and whoever calls towards it will be guided to the straight path.¹

1 Ibn Kathīr states while commenting upon this narration: “Those who attribute this statement to Nabī صلی الله علیه وسلم are mistaken. The most that can be said regarding it is that it is the statement of Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.” Refer to Ibn Kathīr: *Faḍā’il al-Qur’ān* pg. 15. Al-Tirmidhī reports a version wherein it is attributed to Nabī صلی الله علیه وسلم under the section of the reward received for the Qur’ān, the chapter of the virtues of the Qur’ān, number 2906 4/172. Al-Dāramī reports it in his Sunan, the book regarding the virtues of the Qur’ān, the chapter of the merit of the Qur’ān pg. 831 and Imām Aḥmad reports it in his *Musnad* 2/703, number 704 (researched by Aḥmad Shākir. The isnād of this ḥadīth has been criticised. Al-Tirmidhī says, “we do not know this ḥadīth except from these narrators. The isnād is unknown, and Ḥārith (one of the narrators) has been criticised.” Refer to *al-Tirmidhī* 4/172. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn ‘Arabī al-Mālikī says: “The ḥadīth of Ḥārith cannot be relied upon.” Refer to *‘Ārīḍat al-Aḥwadhī* 11/30. Aḥmad Shākir says: “The isnād is quite unauthentic on account of Ḥārith.” Refer to *al-Musnad* 2/704. Another researcher corroborates the above and adds that perhaps the statement was uttered by ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, and thereafter attributed to Nabī by Ḥārith (who was even regarded by some of the scholars to be a liar). *Sharḥ al-Taḥāwīyyah (Takhrīj al-Albānī)* pg. 68. Nonetheless, this statement is reported from ‘Alī رضي الله عنه in the books of the Shī‘ah. Refer to *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 1/3, *al-Burhān* 1/7, *Tafsīr al-ṣāfi* 1/15, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 7/19

Ibn ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ says, “whoever recites the Qur’ān and practices upon it is guaranteed safety from misguidance in this world and protection from being ill-fated in the hereafter by Allah.” Thereafter he recited this verse:

فَمَنْ اتَّبَعَ هُدَايَ فَلَا يَضِلُّ وَلَا يَشْقَى

Then whoever follows My guidance will neither go astray [in the world] nor suffer [in the hereafter].¹

This matter (i.e. the Qur’ān is the actual proof and guide) is so widely accepted that it does not serve any purpose for us to mention all the proofs thereof. We have chosen to suffice upon the Qur’ān itself and that which is reported by the Ahl al-Sunnah from a personality of the Ahl al-Bayt. However, before concluding this discussion, we deem it appropriate to point out those statements in their own books which contradict their claims, as evidence against them regarding their excessive contradictions. We will also shed light upon the objective behind the concoction of such a theory. One of their reliable sources reports the following statement:

ذكر الرضى -رضى الله عنه- يوما القرآن فعظم الحجة فيه... فقال هو جبل الله المتين وعروته الوثقى... جعل دليل البرهان و حجة على كل انسان لا ياتيه الباطل من بين يديه ولا من خلفه تنزيل من حكيم حميد

Al-Riḍā mentioned the Qur’ān one day and he presented a great deal of proof regarding it... thereafter he said, “it is the Rope of Allah which will not snap and the His reliable handhold. It was made the guide of the proof² and evidence against every human. No falsehood will infiltrate it neither from its front nor from the back. It is a revelation from the one who is Wise and Praiseworthy.”³

1 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 123, refer to *Tafsīr Ibn Jarīr* (al-Ṭabarī) 16/225

2 This appears in the source from which this is quoted. However, this seems to be an error. The actual sentence should have been, “It is the guide of the bewildered,” as proof does not need a guide.

3 Al-Majlisī: *Al-Bihār* 92/14, Ibn Bābawayh: *‘Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā* 2/130

Another text of theirs reads:

فاذا التبست عليكم الفتن كقطع الليل المظلم فعليكم بالقرآن فانه شافع مشفع من جعله امامه قاده الى الجنة ومن جعله خلفه ساقه الى النار وهو الدليل يدل على خير السبيل

When trials cause confusion among you, like portions of a dark night, then hold onto the Qur’ān as it is an intercessor whose intercession is upheld. Whoever keeps it in front of him, will be drawn by it to Jannah, and whoever keeps it behind him, it shoves him into hell. It is a guide which guides to the best path.¹

Nahj al-Balāghah, which the Shī’ah attribute to ‘Alī عليه السلام² and believe regarding it that “no falsehood will infiltrate it neither from its front nor from the back”³ reports the following statement:

فالقرآن امر زاجر و صامت ناطق حجة الله على خلقه

Thus, the Qur’ān commands and reproaches. It is silent and it speaks. It is the proof of Allah against His creation.⁴

These texts are corroborated by any others, which exposes to us the degree of contradiction and confusion that exists in the sources of these people. As you have seen, their narrations always contradict one another. The greatest problem

1 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 1/2, *Al-Bihār* 92/17

2 The experts have always expressed great suspicion and doubt regarding the attribution of this book to ‘Alī عليه السلام. Al-Dhahabī says: “Whoever reads *Nahj al-Balāghah* will be convinced that it was falsely attributed to ‘Alī عليه السلام.” Thereafter, he explains the reasons and signs thereof. Refer to *Mizān al-Itidāl* 3/124, under the biography of Sharīf Murtaḍā. More details will appear regarding it under the chapter of the Sunnah, as well as those books wherein it has been analysed and criticised, Allah willing.

3 Al-Hādī Kāshif al-Ghiṭā (a contemporary Shī’ī scholar) states that denying its attribution to ‘Alī عليه السلام, according to them, is in the category of denying that which is obvious. He says: “The condition of all that is narrated in it is the exact same as that which is narrated from Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم.” Refer to *Madārik Nahj al-Balāghah* pg. 190

4 *Nahj al-Balāghah* pg. 265, researched by Ṣubḥī al-Ṣāliḥ, *Al-Bihār* 92/20

that after finding themselves in this state of confusion, they decided to steer themselves out of it by holding onto all that which is against the view of the majority, i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah. Further details regarding this will appear under the section of their beliefs regarding *ijmā'*.

They prefer the views which oppose the views of the majority, even though they have texts which oppose these views. Furthermore, if any of their scholars were to wake up to the call of the truth and openly declare that he opposes them, they simply use their trump card of *Taqiyyah*, as will be discussed under the discussion related to *Taqiyyah*. Whoever ponders regarding this view of the *Shī'ah* concerning the *Qur'ān* — which is established beyond any doubt in their books — will realise that it is a product of one of their malicious enemies, who intended to keep them away from the Book of Allah and His guidance.

This theory makes the *Qur'ān* dependent upon the presence of one who keeps it in place. According to the *Shī'ah*, the only people who can keep it in place are the twelve *Imāms*. This is based on their belief that the *Qur'ān* was only explained to one person, viz. 'Alī عليه السلام. Thereafter, this knowledge was passed on to the twelve *Imāms*. Each *Imām* taught it only to the next *Imām* until this chain ended with the twelfth *Imām*.¹

The twelfth *Imām*, however, is hidden and could not be traced for more than a thousand years. Neither can any of the sects of the *Shī'ah* find him, nor anyone else. Despite this, the *Qur'ān* cannot be used as a source of proof without the *Imām* (who is either hidden, as they claim, or does not exist). In other words, the *Qur'ān* can no longer be used as proof as the one who is to keep it in place is either hidden or does not exist. The *Qur'ān* can no longer be referred to or used as proof as the actual proof is the statement of the *Imām* who is not present (which ultimately means that the *Qur'ān* no longer serves its purpose as a source of proof). This is why the *Akhbārī* sect:

¹ We will discuss this in detail under the chapter of the *Sunnah*, Allah willing.

... rejected the other three sources of proofs,¹ including the Qur'ān, and confined it to only one (i.e. the narrations, which is why) they were given the above-mentioned name.²

This is all that is needed to go astray and lead others away from the path of Allah. This was not where the conspiring against the Book of Allah and the Shī'ah ended, rather, it was one link of the chain, and one tactic from the grand ploy which aimed at distancing the Shī'ah in the furthest possible manner from the majority of the Muslims. It was the first and opening step towards interpreting the Book of Allah against its meaning, as they claimed that these (their concocted interpretations) were from the one who keeps it in place, the Imām from the Ahl al-Bayt. There is no proof besides his statements. He speaks on behalf of the Qur'ān and he alone can explain it. Without him, the Qur'ān cannot serve as proof!

b. Their Belief that the Knowledge of the Qur'ān and its Understanding is Confined to the Imāms

It is a known fact in Islam that the knowledge and understanding of the Qur'ān cannot be a secret confined to a certain bloodline. 'Alī عليه السلام was definitely not singled out as a recipient of this divine blessing, which would mean deprivation of the rest of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. Rather, they were (collectively) the first students thereof, who had the grand opportunity of learning the Qur'ān from the Messenger who was sent to the entire humanity, Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. They then had the privilege of imparting it to the rest of the generations to come. It is only the Shī'ah who deny this fact and fundamental belief of Islam and prefer to believe that Allah had confined all the knowledge contained in the Qur'ān to their twelve A'immaḥ, and they alone know its interpretation. Whoever seeks the knowledge of the Qur'ān from anyone besides them is indeed misguided.

1 Ijmā', the intellect and the glorious Qur'ān.

2 Refer to *al-Taqlīd fī l-Sharī'ah al-Islāmiyyah* pg. 93.

Some sources of the Ahl al-Sunnah state that this belief was originated or at least the roots thereof were planted by Ibn Saba', as he is the one who claimed:

ان القرآن جزء من تسعة اجزاء و علمه عند على

The (present) Qur'ān is one of nine portions, and the knowledge of it by 'Alī.¹

This view is repeated in the books of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah in many different narrations:

A lengthy narration from Abū 'Abd Allāh appears in *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*, wherein he says:

ان الناس يكفيهم القرآن لو وجدوا له مفسرا و ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فسر له لرجل واحد و
فسر للامة شان ذلك الرجل وهو على بن ابي طالب

The Qur'ān is sufficient for people, if they find one who is able to interpret it for them. Rasūlullāh ﷺ interpreted it for one man and he explained the details of that man to the ummah. He is 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.²

Many of their reliable books report the following from Rasūlullāh:

ان الله انزل على القرآن وهو الذى من خالفه ضل و من يبتغى علمه عند غير على هلك

Allah revealed upon me the Qur'ān. It is such a book that whoever opposes it will go astray and whoever seeks the explanation of it from anyone besides 'Alī will be destroyed.³

1 Al-Jowzajānī: *Aḥwāl al-Rijāl* pg. 38

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/25, *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 18/131

3 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 18/138. Refer to *Biḥār al-Anwār* 7/302, 19/23, al-Ṭabarī (al-Rāfiḍī): *Bashārat al-Muṣṭafā* pg. 16, *Amāmlī al-Ṣadūq* pg. 40

It is also claimed in their books that Abū Ja‘far (al-Bāqir) asked Qatādah, “O Qatādah, are you the jurist of the people of Baṣrah?” Qatādah replied, “that is what they say.” Thereupon Abū Ja‘far said:

بلغني انك تفسر القرآن فقال له قتادة نعم -الى ان قال- ويحك يا قتادة انما يعرف القرآن من خوطب به

“It has reached me that you explain the Qur’ān.” Qatādah replied in the affirmative whereupon Abū Ja‘far said:

Woe unto you o Qatādah! Only that person has knowledge of the Qur’ān who was addressed by it.¹

Tafsīr al-Furāt states:

انما على الناس ان يقرؤوا القرآن كما انزل فاذا احتاجوا الى تفسيره فلاهتداء بنا و الينا

The only responsibility of the masses is to recite the Qur’ān as it was revealed. When they require its explanation, then guidance is in (following) us and (coming) to us.²

This chapter is laden with narrations, so much so that if I were to present all that is in front of me right now, it will fill an entire volume. *Al-Kāfī* contains a few chapters, each of which contain a number of their narrations on the subject. They include the following chapters:

1. The Imāms عليهم السلام are the guardians of the decision of Allah and the treasurers of his knowledge.³
2. The ‘Ahl al-Dhikr’, who the creation have been commanded to ask all their questions are only the Imāms.⁴

1 *Al-Kāfī Kitāb al-Rawḍah* 12/415, number 485 (which is printed along with *Sharḥ al-Jāmi’ of al-Māzindarānī*), *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 18/136, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/21-22, *al-Burhān fī Tafsīr al-Qur’ān* 1/18, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/237, 238

2 *Tafsīr Furāt* pg. 91, *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 18/149

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/192

4 *Ibid* 1/210

3. Whenever people are referred to as knowledgeable, it refers to the Imāms.¹
4. The ones who are well-grounded in knowledge are the Imāms.²
5. The Imāms have been granted knowledge and it has been established in their bosoms.³

As for the author of *Al-Biḥār*, as per his habit, has a large collection on this topic. Among his chapter titles are:

1. They are the custodians of the knowledge of the Qur’ān (This chapter contains 54 narrations).⁴
2. They are the treasurers of the knowledge of Allah.⁵
3. The knowledge of the skies and earth is not hidden from them.⁶
4. Nothing is hidden from them.⁷

Wasā’il al-Shī’ah of al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī has a chapter entitled “the impermissibility of extracting laws from the apparent meaning of the Qur’ān by analogy, except after learning their interpretations from the speech of the A’immah”. This chapter contains eighty of their narrations.⁸ *Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah fī Uṣūl al-A’immah* has a chapter titled “none knows the interpretation of the Qur’ān besides the Imāms.”⁹ The author of *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* dedicated one of the introductory chapters of his book to this matter, i.e. “the second introduction — a synopsis of that which has come to us regarding the all the knowledge of the Qur’ān being confined to the Ahl al-

1 Ibid 1/212

2 Ibid 1/213

3 Ibid 1/213

4 *Al-Biḥār* 23/188-205

5 Ibid 26/105

6 Ibid 26/109

7 Ibid 26/137

8 *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 18/129-152

9 Al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī: *Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah* pg. 173

Bayt”.¹ The author of *Muqaddimat al-Burhān* writes, “the fifth chapter : explaining that which indicates that the knowledge of the interpretation of the Qur’ān, or rather, the entire Qur’ān is known only to the Ahl al-Bayt”.² He mentions a few of their narrations regarding this matter after which he says:

اقول و الاخبار في هذا الباب اكثر من ان تحصى

I say, “the narrations in this chapter are too many. They cannot be counted.”³

If we list all the Shī‘ī books in which this has been discussed, the discussion will become lengthy, as this is one of their foundational principles. One of their Ayatollahs⁴ say:

اعلم ان علم القران مخزون عند اهل البيت وهو مما قضت به ضرورة المذهب

Know well that the knowledge of the Qur’ān is securely kept by the Ahl al-Bayt. This is from the fundamentals of the madh-hab.⁵

It is quite amazing that based upon the claim that the Imāms alone have the knowledge of the Qur’ān, they claim that they have knowledge regarding everything. Abū ‘Abd Allāh (asl-Ṣādiq) says (as they falsely assert):

انى لاعلم ما فى السموات و اعلم ما فى الارضين و اعلم ما فى الجنة و اعلم ما فى النار و اعلم ما كان و ما يكون ثم مكث هنيهة فرأى ان ذلك كبر على من سمعه فقال علمت ذلك من كتاب الله ان الله يقول فيه تبيان كل شئ

Indeed I know what is in the heavens, what is in the earths, what is in Jannah, what is in Jahannam, what happened in the past and what will

1 *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/19

2 *Muqaddimat al-Burhān* pg. 15

3 *Ibid* pg. 16

4 Ḥusayn al-Barūjardī – one of their contemporary scholars

5 *Tafsīr al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm* 3/4

happen in the future. He paused for a while and noticed that his speech weighed heavily upon those who heard it. Thus he said, “I learnt all of it from the Book of Allah. Allah says in it ‘the explanation of everything.’”¹

Look at this text which is attributed to Ja‘far رَحِمَهُ اللهُ — and we stand witness to his innocence, as his piety and leadership does not allow this. The one who concocted it claims that he knew everything, but he was ignorant of even that which he was quoting as the Qur’ān does not contain any verse such as “تبيين كل شيء”, the correct wording of the verse is تبيينا لكل شيء ². Allah disgraced him by exposing his ignorance regarding this verse. This mistake also serves as a clear proof that these texts are from the fabrications of an irreligious individual who infiltrated the ranks of the Muslims in a move to plot against Islam and Muslims.

Analysis and Criticism of this View

Analysis of the Texts

The reader should be aware that it is beyond us to quote all their texts on this matter, gather them here and analyse them, due to their abundance. Doing so would require a great amount of pages. It is more appropriate for us to cite a few examples therefrom, as all echo the same meaning, i.e. the knowledge of the Qur’ān was confined to twelve Imāms, it is kept as a treasure by them and they, by means of it, have knowledge regarding everything. We will now pause and analyse and examine each text that we have quoted. Thereafter, we will return to the actual belief and analyse it.

The First Text: Wherein it is Claimed that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ Explained the Qur’ān Only to ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ

Allah سُبحانه وتعالى says:

وَأَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ الذِّكْرَ لِتُبَيِّنَ لِلنَّاسِ مَا نُزِّلَ إِلَيْهِمْ وَلَعَلَّهُمْ يَتَفَكَّرُونَ

¹ Al-Bihār 26/111

² Sūrah al-Naḥl: 89

And We revealed to you the message [i.e., the Qur’ān] that you may make clear to the people what was sent down to them and that they might give thought.¹

The books of the Shī’ah, as we have previously mentioned, state that it is not the duty of the Rasūl to explain the Qur’ān to the people. Rather, his duty is to explain “the position of that man — ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib”. As for explaining the Qur’ān to the people, this was the duty and deputation of ‘Alī, not Muḥammad. The speech of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah at this juncture is akin to the speech of one of the extremist sects, the Gharābiyyah — who would say that Muḥammad ﷺ resembled ‘Alī ﷺ to a greater degree than that of the resemblance between two crows. Allah had sent Jibrīl with revelation to ‘Alī, but he was mistaken and thus passed on the revelation to Muḥammad.²

Is there any real difference between this view and the view of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah? The Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah have also passed on the task of conveying the message of Allah to ‘Alī ﷺ (instead of Muḥammad ﷺ). The only difference is that they did not accuse Jibrīl of making a mistake. According to this, the only duty which was assigned to Nabī ﷺ was, the introducing of ‘Alī ﷺ and explaining his position. I leave it upon the reader to ponder over the rest of the similarities, as they are self-evident.

The Second Text: Whoever Seeks the Knowledge of the Qur’ān from Anyone Besides ‘Alī ﷺ will be Destroyed

We believe that whoever seeks the knowledge of the Qur’ān from the Qur’ān, the Sunnah and the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, among whom is ‘Alī ﷺ, will definitely be guided. The claim that whoever seeks it from any source besides ‘Alī is totally unknown and foreign to Islām. In fact, its falsity is obvious, Nabī ﷺ

1 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 44

2 Ibn Ḥazm: *al-Fiṣal* 5/42, al-Baghdādī: *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg. 250, al-Isfarāyīnī: *al-Tabṣīr fī l-Dīn* pg. 74, Ibn al-Murtaḍā: *al-Munyat wa l-Amal* pg. 30, al-Milṭī: *al-Tanbīh wa l-Radd* pg. 157 (he named them al-Jumhūriyyah).

did not ever confine the knowledge of Islam and the sharī'ah to any specific Ṣaḥābī, thereby depriving the rest of his companions thereof. The above-quoted verse, “and We revealed to you the message [i.e., the Qur’ān] that you may make clear to the people what was sent down to them,” very clearly points out that the explanation was presented to the people and not to a specific individual or group of people, even though they were from the household of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

Added to the above, Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه denied the claim that Rasūlullāh ﷺ taught him anything that was not taught to others. Also, Nabī ﷺ addressed his Ṣaḥābah (and included the rest of the generations after them in this address), saying to them that they should convey his message and he exhorted them fervently to do so. Zayd ibn Thābit as well as others narrates:

نضر الله امرا سميع منا حديثا فحفظه حتى يبلغه غيره فانه رب حامل فقهه ليس بفقيه و رب حامل فقهه الى من هو افقه منه

May Allah safeguard (the faculties and abilities of) the person who hears a ḥadīth from us, memorises it and passes it on to others. Many a carrier of knowledge does not have a comprehensive understanding thereof, and many a carrier of knowledge conveys it to those who surpass him in understanding it...¹

This ḥadīth is also found in the reliable books of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah.² Thus there remains no reason for it not to serve as proof against them.

1 Reported by Aḥmad 5/183 (the quoted text is verbatim from his book), al-Dārimī: *Muqaddimah*, Bāb al-Iqtidā bī l-‘Ulamā’ 1/73, Abū Dāwūd: *Kitāb al-‘Ilm*, Bāb Fāḍl Nashr al-‘Ilm 4/68-69, Ibn Mājah: *al-Muqaddimah*, Bāb Man Ballagha ‘Ilmān 1/84, al-Tirmidhī: *Kitāb al-‘Ilm*, Bāb mā jā’fi l-Ḥathth ‘alā Tabliḡh al-Simā’ 5/33-34, Ibn Ḥibbān: *Ṣaḥīḥ* (refer to *Mowrid al-Zam’ān*, Kitāb al-‘Ilm, Bāb Riwāyat al-Ḥadīth li man Fahimahū wa li man lam Yafhamhū pg. 47). Ibn Ḥajar says in *Takhrīj al-Mukhtaṣar*: “This ḥadīth of Zayd ibn Thābit is authentic. It is reported by Aḥmad, Abū Dāwūd, Ibn Ḥibbān, Ibn Abī Ḥātim, al-Khaṭīb, Abū Nu’aym, al-Ṭayālīsī and al-Tirmidhī. This subject also has narrations from Mu’adh ibn Jabal, Abū al-Dardā, Anas, etc.” Refer to *Fayḍ al-Qadīr* 6/285. It has also been quoted in *al-Silsilat al-Aḥādīth al-Ṣaḥīḥah* 1/689-690. Shaykh ‘Abd al-Muḥsin al-‘Ibād has a treatise on it titled, *Dirāsāt Ḥadīth Naḍḍar Allah Imra’an Samī’ā Maqālātī, Riwayatan wa Dirāyatan*.

2 Refer to *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/403, al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī: *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 18/63

The Third Text

None were addressed by the Qur'ān besides the twelve Imāms. Thus, none knows the Qur'ān besides them.

انما يعرف القرآن من خوطب به

Woe unto you o Qatādah! Only that person has knowledge of the Qur'ān who was addressed by it.¹

It is for this very reason that the noble Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, the generation after them and the scholars of Islām along the centuries have been described as “those who are doomed and have brought doom (upon others)” on account of them shouldering the task and responsibility of explaining the Qur'ān in accordance to its principles. Another reason could be that they believed that the Qur'ān contains that which none will be excused for being ignorant thereof, that which the Arabs have always known, as it was part of their speech, that which is only known to the scholars and that which is not known to anyone except Allah.²

The Shī'ah claim that none have the knowledge of the Qur'ān besides the Imāms, and they possess all the knowledge of the Qur'ān. This is claim that needs to be backed by proof. However, it is belied by both logic as well as narration. Most of all, their books of Tafsīr are the greatest of testimonies against them, as will be seen!

The Fourth Text

The duty of the entire humanity, besides the Imāms, is only to recite the Qur'ān. Nobody is allowed to undertake the responsibility of explaining it besides the

1 *Al-Kāfī Kitāb al-Rawḍāh* 12/415, number 485 (which is printed along with *Sharḥ al-Jāmi' of al-Māzindarānī*), *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 18/136, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/21-22, *al-Burhān fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān* 1/18, *Bihār al-Anwār* 24/237, 238

2 A statement to this meaning has been narrated from Ibn 'Abbās رضي الله عنه. Refer to *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 1/76 (researched by Aḥmad Shākir and Maḥmūd Shākir) and *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 1/5.

Imāms. Nabī ﷺ himself was not allowed to do so, as his responsibility was only to “explain the details of that man”. Thus, the prohibition applied to a greater extent to the Ṣaḥābah, pious predecessors and leading scholars of the ummah. If anyone requires the explanation of any verse of the Qur’ān, his only option is to place his query before those who possess the knowledge of the Qur’ān, i.e. their Imāms.

Now, if that is the case, then let us ask, what can we find in the books of *Tafsīr* or other books of the Shī’ah such as *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, *al-‘Ayyāshī*, *al-Burhān*, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi*, *al-Kāfi* and *Al-Bihār* under the explanations of the verses of the Qur’ān which are attributed to the Imāms? One who looks, will find that the interpretations offered there are supposedly ‘hidden’ meanings. They are not, in any way, linked to the text of the Qur’ān, the contexts wherein they appear, their meanings or implications. This will be demonstrated in the examples that will appear.

As stated, the greatest testimony that stands against this view of the Shī’ah is their own books of *Tafsīr*. Further, the texts quoted from their books on the subject deter people from pondering over and reflecting upon the Qur’ān and understanding its meanings. This is clearly a form of preventing people from the dīn of Allah and His sharī’ah. Perhaps, the secret behind the concoction of this fallacy is to prevent the Shī’ah from studying the Book of Allah, reflecting upon it and understanding it, as that would embarrass the founders of the religion by exposing their colossal amount of lies, misguided schemes and flawed methodology of interpreting the Qur’ān (by claiming that their interpretations are a reflection of the internal or secret meanings).

An Analysis of this View

This view is based on the belief that the Rasūl ﷺ passed on all the knowledge of the Qur’ān to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. This view raised its head in the very lifetime of Amīr al-Mu’minīn, as the Saba’iyyah openly claimed that ‘Alī رضي الله عنه is the sole possessor of some knowledge. Consequently, he made an open declaration to the contrary saying:

والذى فلق الحبة و برء النسمة ما عندنا الا ما فى القرآن الا فهما يعطى رجل فى كتابه

By the oath of the one who caused the seed to split and created every being, we do not possess except that which is in the Qur'ān besides understanding which a man is blessed with regarding the Book of Allah.

A fact that simply cannot be overlooked is that Rasūlullāh ﷺ explained the meanings of the verses of the Qur'ān to his Ṣaḥābah, just as he taught them the wording thereof. The following verse refers to both, the words as well as the meanings:

وَأَنزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ الذِّكْرَ لِتُبَيِّنَ لِلنَّاسِ مَا نُزِّلَ إِلَيْهِمْ وَلَعَلَّهُمْ يَتَفَكَّرُونَ

And We revealed to you the message [i.e., the Qur'ān] that you may explain clearly to the people what was sent down to them and that they might give thought.¹

Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī² said:

Those who taught us the Qur'ān ('Uthmān ibn 'Affān, 'Abd Allāh ibn Mas'ūd and others) narrated to us that when they would learn from Nabī ﷺ, they would not learn more than ten verses until they had fully grasped the knowledge of what they had learnt and brought it into practise. Thus they would say:

1 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 44

2 The Qārī of Kūfah, the luminary, Imām 'Abd Allāh ibn Ḥabīb ibn Rabī'ah al-Kūfī. He was from the generation of the children of the Ṣaḥābah. He was born during the lifetime of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, and he learnt the Qur'ān from 'Uthmān, 'Alī, Zayd, Ubay and Ibn Mas'ūd رضى الله عنه. Refer to al-Dhahabī: *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 4/267, al-Sūyūṭī: *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥuffāz* pg. 19. He should not be confused with the sufi and scholar who goes by the same name (Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī), who is the author of *Ḥaqā'iq al-Tafsīr* and he passed away in the year 412 A.H. He was guilty of attributing explanations to Abū Ja'far (al-Bāqir) which are in fact the views of the Bāṭiniyyah, and Abū Ja'far had nothing to do with them. Refer to Ibn Taymiyyah: *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/146, *al-Fatāwā* 13/242-243, al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 2/248-249 and al-Dhahabī: *Mīzān al-'itidāl* 3/523.

We learnt the Qur'ān, understood the knowledge (contained therein) and practised upon it all together.¹

Thus, it comes as no surprise that they would take a while to learn each surah. They were practically implementing the following advices of Allah ﷻ:

كِتَبٌ أَنْزَلْنَاهُ إِلَيْكَ مُبَارَكٌ لِيَدَّبَّرُوا آيَاتِهِ وَلِيَتَذَكَّرَ أُولُوا الْأَلْبَابِ

(This is) a blessed Book which We have revealed to you, [O Muḥammad], that they might reflect upon its verses and that those of understanding would be reminded.²

أَفَلَا يَتَذَكَّرُونَ الْقُرْآنَ

Then do they not reflect upon the Qur'ān.³

أَفَلَمْ يَدَّبَّرُوا الْقَوْلَ

Then have they not reflected over the word [i.e., the Qur'ān].⁴

1 Refer to Ibn Taymiyyah: *Majmū' Fatāwā* 13/331. Al-Ṭabarī also narrates this in his *Tafsīr* (1/80). The researcher stated in the footnote of this narration: “This is an unbroken and reliable isnād.” Refer to *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* which was researched by Maḥmūd Shākir and Aḥmad Shākir. Al-Ṭabarī also records it from Ḥusayn ibn Wāqīd-A'mash-Shaqīq from — Ibn Mas'ūd: “When one of us would learn ten verses, he would not proceed further until he understood its meanings and practised upon it.” (1/80) The researcher comments, “this is an authentic isnād.” Although it is narrated from Ibn Mas'ūd رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, it holds the same weight as that which is narrated from Rasūlullāh ﷺ, as he learnt the Qur'ān from Nabī ﷺ. Thus, he narrates to us the methodology of the illuminated era of nubuwwah. *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 1/80. Shu'ayb al-Arna'ūṭ commented on this ḥadīth saying: “The narrators are reliable.” Refer to his footnotes of *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 4/270

2 Surah Ṣād: 29

3 Sūrah al-Nisā: 82, Sūrah Muḥammad: 24

4 Sūrah al-Mu'minūn: 68

A fact that needs no mention but will be mentioned due to it being ignored is that it is impossible to ponder upon the Qur'ān without understanding its meanings. Another verse which exposes the lies behind their view is:

إِنَّا أَنْزَلْنَاهُ قُرْآنًا عَرَبِيًّا لَعَلَّكُمْ تَعْقِلُونَ

Indeed, We have sent it down as an Arabic Qur'ān that you might understand.¹

Added to these proofs, it is also well known to all that the purpose of speech is that the meaning thereof should be understood. Simply grasping the words is definitely not the goal. Due to all of these proofs, this doctrine of the Shī'ah became indigestible to many of them as well. Consequently, they wriggled their way out of it saying that the knowledge of the outward meanings are not confined to the twelve Imāms, but they are known to all. The knowledge which is confined to the Imāms is the inner or secret meanings.

This caused a huge disagreement between the Uṣūlīs and Akhbārīs as far as considering the apparent meanings of the verses to be proof. The first group believes, based upon the verses which call upon everyone to ponder over the Qur'ān and understand it, that they do serve as proof, whilst the second group insists that the knowledge of the Qur'ān, be it the apparent meanings or the secret ones, is confined to the twelve Imāms.²

The claim that the Qur'ān was not explained to anyone besides 'Alī عليه السلام renders the following verse meaningless or at least distorts its meaning:

وَأَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ الذِّكْرَ لِتُبَيِّنَ لِلنَّاسِ مَا نُزِّلَ إِلَيْهِمْ وَلَعَلَّهُمْ يَتَفَكَّرُونَ

1 Sūrah Yūsuf: 2

2 Many of their books on Tafsīr and Uṣūl al-Fiqh have discussed this matter. refer to al-Khū'ī: *al-Bayān* pg. 263, al-Barujardī: *Tafsīr al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm* 2/175, al-Muẓaffar: *Uṣūl al-Fiqh* 3/130, al-Ḥakīm: *al-Uṣūl al-Āmmah li'l-Fiqh al-Muqārin* pg. 102-105, al-Maythamī: *Qawāmi' al-Fuṣūl* pg. 298

And We revealed to you the message [i.e., the Qur’ān] that you may explain clearly to the people what was sent down to them and that they might give thought.¹

The instruction is quite clear — a clear explanation to the people, not only ‘Alī عليه السلام. Now, the champions of this doctrine will have only one of two options; either they will accuse Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم of not conveying that which was revealed to them, or they will disbelieve in the Qur’ān. Both options are in stark contradiction to the basics of Islam as well as the demands of intelligence. Added to that, this doctrine is disproved by the number of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم being known for their expertise in explaining the Qur’ān such as; the four khulafā’, Ibn Mas‘ūd, Ibn ‘Abbās, Zayd ibn Thābit رضي الله عنه, etc. In fact, “Alī would praise the commentaries of Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه.”²

Ibn Taymiyyah says:

The amount of narrations that Allah willed, in which the commentaries of Ibn ‘Abbās is reported are all authentic and established. However, none of them contain the name of ‘Alī عليه السلام, whereas Ibn ‘Abbās narrates from other Ṣaḥābah including ‘Umar, Abū Hurayrah, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf, Zayd ibn Thābit and Usāmah ibn Zayd among others from the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رضي الله عنه. His narrations from ‘Alī are extremely few in number, and they do not appear in the books whose authors sufficed upon authentic aḥādīth. In these books, his narrations from ‘Umar, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf, Abū Hurayrah and others رضي الله عنه are narrated. The Muslims do not possess any authentic (complete) Tafsīr which can be attributed to ‘Alī عليه السلام. The books of ḥadīth and Tafsīr are filled with narrations from the Ṣaḥābah and Tābi‘īn, with a very minimal amount being from ‘Alī عليه السلام. Also, most of that which is attributed to Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq is nothing but fabrications.³

1 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 44

2 Refer to Ibn ‘Aṭīyyah: *al-Muḥarrar al-Wajīz* 1/19, Ibn Juzayy: *al-Tashīl* 1/9

3 *Minḥāj al-Sunnah* 4/155

The other claim (that the Imāms have knowledge of the entire Qur'ān) is also clear exaggeration. The matter is as stated by Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī:

There are some portions of the Qur'ān that cannot be understood without an explanation from Rasūlullāh ﷺ. They are clarifications of that which is equivocal in the revealed form, and the masses are in need of its explanation as it includes the laws of dīn, such as commandments, prohibitions, clarification of that which is permissible and impermissible, mention of the punishments and the laws of inheritance. None could have known the meanings without the explanation of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, who would not have known them without revelation from Allah. There are other portions as well, the interpretations of which are not known to anyone besides Allah, the Almighty. This applies to all those matters, the knowledge of which Allah preferred to keep to Himself such as the time of the final hour, the blowing of the trumpet, etc. A third portion also exists, which is understood by all those who understand Arabic, the language in which the Qur'ān was revealed.¹

Another established fact which is challenged by their claim that 'Alī رضي الله عنه was the only one who transferred the knowledge of the Qur'ān, is the fact that the laws of the Qur'ān were passed down to each generation, starting from the Ṣaḥābah, with tawātur; as their claim suggests that this transmission was done by only one person, i.e. 'Alī رضي الله عنه.

The crux of the issue is that this doctrine was a ploy, the goal of which was to prevent (the Shī'ah) from the Book of Allah, to turn them away from pondering over its contents, learning from its guidance, reflecting upon its lessons and contemplating upon its meanings and objectives. Hence in the religion of the Shī'ah, there is no way that the meanings of the Qur'ān can be understood, except through the twelve Imāms. The rest of humanity should remain deprived of benefitting therefrom. Undoubtedly, this is a ploy, the object of which cannot remain hidden. This is because the Book of Allah was revealed in clear Arabic and

1 *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 1/73-74, 87-88

the entire humanity was addressed therein. Allah says:

إِنَّا أَنْزَلْنَاهُ قُرْآنًا عَرَبِيًّا لَعَلَّكُمْ تَعْقِلُونَ

Indeed, We have sent it down as an Arabic Qur'ān that you might understand.¹

هَذَا بَيَانٌ لِلنَّاسِ وَهُدًى وَمَوْعِظَةٌ لِلْمُتَّقِينَ

This [Qur'ān] is a clear statement to [all] the people and a guidance and instruction for those conscious of Allāh.²

Allah commanded his bondsmen to ponder over the Qur'ān and take lessons from its examples. It is impossible that a person can be commanded to ponder over what he is told if he does not know what is being said to him or he does not understand its meaning. How can he be told, “take a lesson from that which you do not understand”?³

It is also an attempt to render meaningless the great knowledge regarding the Tafsīr of the Qur'ān which was conveyed to us by the Ṣaḥābah and pious predecessors. All of these treasures are worthless and useless according to the Shī'ah, as they are not reported from the twelve Imāms. This has also been explicitly mentioned by one of the contemporary scholars:

ان جميع التفاسير الواردة عن غير اهل البيت لا قيمة لها ولا يعتد بها

All the commentaries which are not narrated from the Ahl al-Bayt have no value and they cannot be relied upon.⁴

According to them, only their books of Tafsīr hold any value. This forces us to ask, “what do their books contain?” A study of their reliable books such as *Tafsīr*

1 Sūrah Yūsuf: 2

2 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 138

3 Refer to *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 1/82

4 Muḥammad Riḍā al-Najafī: *al-Shī'ah wa l-Raj'ah* pg. 19

al-Qummī, *al-‘Ayyāshī*, *al-Ṣāfi* and *al-Burhān*, as well as their ḥadīth books the likes of *al-Kāfi* and *Al-Biḥār* reveals such interpretations of the Book of Allah which are attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt which reflect (in most cases) gross ignorance regarding the Book of Allah, interpretations which are open fallacies and twists of the meaning which cannot be hidden. The attribution of these interpretations to the scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt is defied by the simplest of logic.

This is because these explanations have no connection to the wording, its meanings and implications or even the context of the verses of the Qur’ān, as will be established from a few examples of their commentaries. The implication of this attribution, after taking cognizance of their belief, is that these fallacies and statements (which reflect gross ignorance regarding the Book of Allah) are the pinnacle of the knowledge of the scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt. The insults, disparagement and accusation of ignorance contained in this belief against the Ahl al-Bayt exceed all limits, especially from a people who are claimants of their love and *tashayyu’* (support).

The matter does not end here. In fact, the greatest potential damage that is contained in this belief is their view that these are the meanings of the Qur’ān and the knowledge thereof. There is no other meaning to the Qur’ān which surpasses them, as they emerged from the original and sole source, which alone was authenticated and approved to convey it. This is a defamation of the Qur’ān and it belittles the position accorded to it. It is no exaggeration to say that this is open war against the Qur’ān and a wicked smear campaign to deter people from drawing close to it.

c. Their Belief that the Imām has the Right to Abrogate Verses, Restrict the General Commands of the Qur’ān and Add Conditions to those which were Revealed Without any Conditions Attached to them, etc.

This belief is founded upon the following Shī‘ah beliefs; the Imām is the one who keeps the Qur’ān in place, he is the speaking Qur’ān, the Imāms are the treasurers

of the knowledge of Allah and His confidants¹ concerning His revelation² and that the sharī'ah was not complete at the time of the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, but he passed on the remainder to 'Alī رضي الله عنه, who extracted from it that which applied to his era, and then passed on the rest to the next Imām who did the same, until this reached the absent Imām.³

Based on the above, abrogation of verses, restricting general commands and adding conditions to verses which were revealed without any conditions attached to them, did not end with the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, as prophetic statements and divine additions to the law continued after his death, until the beginning of the fourth century when the major occultation⁴ took place after which they could no longer communicate with their Imām and receive from him divine revelation — as they believe:

ان حديث كل واحد من الائمة الطاهرين قول الله عز وجل ولا اختلاف فى اقوالهم كما لا اختلاف فى
قوله تعالى

The speech of each one of the pure Imāms is in fact the speech of Allah the most honoured and majestic. There is no inconsistency in their speech, just as there is no inconsistency in the speech of Allah سبحانه وتعالى.⁵

They go to the extent of saying that one who hears a ḥadīth from Abū 'Abd Allah (Ja'far al-Ṣādiq) has the right to narrate this very ḥadīth from his father (Muḥammad al-Ṣādiq), any of his fore-fathers or even directly attribute it to Allah سبحانه وتعالى.⁶ Thus, the Imām has all the required rights to abrogate verses, restrict the general commands of the Qur'ān and add conditions to those which were revealed without any conditions attached to them, as it is one verse of the Qur'ān

1 Refer to the marginal notes of *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/192.

2 Refer to *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*, Bāb Ann al-A'imma Wulāt Amr Allah wa Khazanat 'Ilmih 1/192

3 *Faṣl al-Sunnah*

4 Refer to the discussion on Ghaybah in this book.

5 Al-Māzindarānī: *Sharḥ al-Jāmi'* ('Alī al-Kāfi) 2/272

6 *ibid*

being used to explain another verse, based upon their concocted belief that the speech of the Imām is the Speech of Allah.

One of the contemporary Ayatollahs explains this belief of theirs:

ان حكمة التدریج اقتضت بیان جملة من الاحكام و كتمان جملة و لكنه سلام الله عليه اودعها عند اوصيائه كل وصی يعهد بها الى الاخر لينشرها في الوقت المناسب لها حسب الحكمة من عام مخصص او مطلق او مقيد او مجمل مبين الى امثال ذلك فقد يذكر النبي عاما و يذكر مخصصه بعد برهة من حياته و قد لا يذكره اصلا بل يودعه عند وصيه الى وقته

The wisdom of gradual (revelation) demanded that some commands should be explained and others should be hidden. However, he ﷺ passed them on to his Awṣiyā', and each Waṣī passed it on to the next one, so that he could explain it at the appropriate time, according to the demands of wisdom as far as the general command is concerned, whether it should be specified, left as is, have a condition to it or an ambiguous command that is explained, etc. At times Nabī ﷺ would mention a general command and later on he would add clauses. At times he would not even mention these clauses, but rather he would disclose it to the Waṣī to mention it in his time.¹

The matters of abrogation, specification and adding clauses is only part of the greater job of the Imāms, which is *al-Tafwīḍ fi l-Dīn* — deputation in matters of dīn. The author of *al-Kāfī* affirms this under a chapter dedicated to it under the title, “the chapter of tafwīḍ to Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the Imāms in the matters of dīn”.² Thus, matters of this dīn have been handed over to the Imāms, just as they were handed over to Rasūlullāh ﷺ. They have the right to pass laws. The books of the Shī'ah state regarding the Imāms:

ان الله عز وجل ... فوض الى نبيه صلى الله عليه وسلم فقال وَمَا آتِيَكُمْ الرَّسُولُ فَخُذُوهُ وَمَا نَهَاكُمْ عَنْهُ فَانْتَهُوا فما فوض الى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم و اله فوضه الينا

1 Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā: *Aṣl al-Shī'ah* pg. 77

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/265

Allah, the honoured and magnificent handed over the matters of dīn to Nabī ﷺ. He said, “and whatever the Messenger has given you, take; and what he has forbidden you, refrain from,”¹ whatever was handed over to Rasūlullāh ﷺ, has been handed over to us.²

Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq), according to their books, said:

لا والله ما فوض الله الى احد من خلقه الا الى رسول الله صلى الله عليه و اله و الى الائمة قال عز و جل :
 اِنَّا اَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ لِتَحْكُمَ بَيْنَ النَّاسِ بِمَا أَرَاكَ اللَّهُ وَهِيَ جَارِيَةٌ فِي الْأَوْصِيَاءِ

By the oath of Allah, Allah did not hand over (the matters of dīn) except to Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the Imāms. He, the honoured and magnificent says, “indeed, We have revealed to you, [O Muḥammad], the Book in truth so you may judge between the people by that which Allah has shown you,”³ this applies to the Imāms (as well).⁴

The Imāms are the custodians of the knowledge of the angels, the ambiyā’ and the messengers. They have all the books that were divinely revealed, as established by their reliable books in the form of many narrations, as will appear.⁵ These important matters of forming the laws are all part of the blessings of this knowledge which is kept as a treasure by the Imāms.

As for the practical application of this belief, it manifests itself in the destructive amount of narrations regarding doctrine and other matters wherein they have isolated themselves from the rest of the Muslim ummah and opposed them. As an example, the words of kufr, kuffār, shirk and mushrikīn which appear in the Book of Allah ﷻ and include all those who commit these crimes are specified by them to apply to only those who reject the Wilāyah of ‘Alī and those who take another Imām along with him, as will be explained.⁶

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 7

2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/266

3 Sūrah al-Nisā: 105

4 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/268

5 Faṣl al-Sunnah, the discussion of īmān upon the Book of Allah.

6 The proofs of this will appear under the discussion, “examples of Shī’ī interpretations of the verses of the Qur’ān”.

Thus, they have specified a general rule of the Book of Allah, without any text which allows them to do so. Instead, they have altered the text under the pretext of specifying its purport. They have equated or rather, granted more importance to the matter of Imāmah than kufr and shirk, despite not having any sound textual or logical proof. By doing so, they have belittled the consensus of the Muslims as well as the texts of dīn which were transmitted with tawātur. Added to that, they have even displayed ignorance regarding the language in which the glorious Qur’ān was revealed:

إِنَّا أَنْزَلْنَاهُ قُرْآنًا عَرَبِيًّا لَعَلَّكُمْ تَعْقِلُونَ

Indeed, We have sent it down as an Arabic Qur’ān that you might understand.¹

We will soon present many examples of this type of tampering with the meaning of the Qur’ān.

An Analysis of this Belief

Allah ﷻ terminated *risālah* (sending of messengers) through the medium of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, and culminated the dīn by sending him. *Waḥī* (revelation) was thus ended with his death. These are facts regarding the dīn which are known to all and sundry. However, the above belief of the Shī’ah cannot be validated except if all of these facts are rejected. Undoubtedly, this is an outright contradiction of the reality of the testimony that Muḥammad is the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ, which is a pre-condition for anyone to be entered into the fold of Islam.

Perhaps the one who ponders regarding this belief and calculates its dimensions will reach the conclusion that the ultimate goal behind it is to change the dīn of Islam and alter the laws revealed upon Muḥammad ﷺ. The Speech of Allah has become the target of changes and alterations by the means of abrogation, specifications, conditions, explanations or general statements which the scholars of the Shī’ah claim are narrated from their Imāms.

1 Sūrah Yūsuf: 2

The idea of changing and altering Islam will become even clearer if one takes note of the excessive lies spoken by these people, to the extent that they even consider deceit to be a noble act of their religion, as will be proven.¹ “Whoever studies the books regarding criticism and commendation (of personalities) will find that those who were found by their authors to be liars are far greater in number among the Shī‘ah, as compared to any other sect.”²

A large number of leading Muslim scholars have testified that there is no group which spoke more lies and presented more false testimonies than them. They fabricate narrations and thereafter take the same to be part of their religion. They were always labelled, rightfully, as liars. The people of knowledge prohibited students from listening to aḥādīth from these Rawāfiḍ.³ In fact, the very books of these people contain narrations from the Ahl al-Bayt, wherein they voice their displeasure regarding the lies and accusations that are levelled against them by this sect.⁴

This belief rests, primarily, upon the claim that Islam is an incomplete religion and it is in need of the twelve Imāms in order to bring it to its completion. The Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Rasūl were not sufficient to bring the dīn to its completion, as the remainder was kept by the Imāms. Also, the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ (who was sent for the guidance of humanity at large), instead of conveying that which was revealed to him by his Rabb, hid away some of it and secretly passed it on to ‘Alī.

All of the above is open disbelief in Allah and His Rasūl, and it goes against the basic principles of Islam, in the light of the following verses:

1 Refer to “the matter of Taqiyyah”

2 Refer to *al-Muntaqā* pg. 22

3 Refer to *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/16, 17, *al-Sūyūṭī: Tadrīb al-Rāwī* 1/327

4 *Al-Biḥār* 25/263, *al-Māmaqānī: Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* 1/174, *Rijāl al-Kashshī* numbers; 174, 216, 541, 542, 544, 549, 588, 659, 741, 909, 1007, 1048. Some of these will appear under the discussion, “their beliefs regarding the Sunnah”.

الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ وَأَتِمَمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ نِعْمَتِي وَرَضِيتُ لَكُمُ الْإِسْلَامَ دِينًا

This day I have perfected for you your religion and completed My favour upon you and have approved for you Islam as religion.¹

وَنَزَّلْنَا عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ تِبْيَانًا لِّكُلِّ شَيْءٍ وَهُدًى وَرَحْمَةً وَبُشْرَىٰ لِلْمُسْلِمِينَ

And We have sent down to you the Book as clarification for all things and as guidance and mercy and good tidings for the Muslims.²

وَإِذْ أَخَذَ اللَّهُ مِيثَاقَ الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ لَتُبَيِّنُنَّهُ لِلنَّاسِ وَلَا تَكْتُمُونَهُ

And [mention, O Muḥammad], when Allah took a covenant from those who were given the Scripture, [saying], “You must make it clear [i.e., explain it] to the people and not conceal it.”³

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَكْتُمُونَ مَا أَنْزَلْنَا مِنَ الْبَيِّنَاتِ وَالْهُدَىٰ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا بَيَّنَّاهُ لِلنَّاسِ فِي الْكِتَابِ ۚ أُولَٰئِكَ يَلْعَنُهُمُ اللَّهُ وَيَلْعَنُهُمُ اللَّعُنُونَ ﴿١٥٩﴾ إِلَّا الَّذِينَ تَابُوا وَأَصْلَحُوا وَبَيَّنُّوا فَأُولَٰئِكَ أَتُوبُ عَلَيْهِمْ وَأَنَا التَّوَّابُ الرَّحِيمُ ﴿١٦٠﴾

Indeed, those who conceal what We sent down of clear proofs and guidance after We made it clear for the people in the Scripture — those are cursed by Allah and cursed by those who curse. Except for those who repent and correct themselves and make evident. Those — I will accept their repentance, and I am the Accepting of repentance, the Merciful.⁴

Imām al-Ash‘arī has attributed this belief to the fifteenth category of the extremist Shī‘ah, according to his categorisation. “They are the ones who believe that the

1 Sūrah al-Mā‘idah: 3

2 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 89

3 Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 187

4 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 159

Imāms annul the laws of Islam, angels descend upon them, signs and miracles are manifested upon their hands and they receive revelation.”¹ These beliefs have now become part of the fundamental beliefs of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah², as they have sucked out their doctrines and beliefs from the residue left on the thumbs of each group of extremists. Abū Ja‘far al-Naḥḥās (d. 338 A.H) indicated towards this belief without attributing it to any specific group. He says:

Others believe, “the door of abrogating (verses) and the abrogated ones are in the hands of the Imām, he has the right to abrogate anything he wishes.”³

He then declares those to be a great form of kufr, after which he explained its falsity saying:

Abrogation was not even the right of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, except if he received revelation from Allah ﷻ. This would either happen in the form of a Qur’ānic verses, just like it (the abrogated one) or through revelation which was not Qur’ān.⁴ Since these two ended with the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, the matter of abrogation also came to an end.⁵

1 *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/88

2 To learn more regarding the acceptance of the belief that the Imāms receive revelation and the angels descend upon them by the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah, refer to the section of the Sunnah in this book. As for their acceptance of the belief that miracles are displayed at the hands of the Imāms, refer to the discussion, “Imān upon the messengers,” of this book.

3 *Al-Nāsikh wa l-Mansūkh* pg. 8

4 i.e. the Sunnah of Muḥammad ﷺ, as Allah ﷻ says:

وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ ۖ إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَىٰ ﴿٤﴾

Nor does he speak from [his own] inclination. It is not but a revelation revealed. (Sūrah al-Najm: 3-4)

5 *Al-Nāsikh wa l-Mansūkh* pg. 8-9

Discussion Two

Their Beliefs Regarding the Interpretation of the Qur'ān

This discussion involves two issues:

- a. Their belief that the Qur'ān has inner meanings which contradict the apparent one or the wording.
- b. Their belief that most of the Qur'ān was revealed regarding them and their enemies.

a) The Qur'ān Has Inner Meanings which Contradict the Apparent Meaning

This belief was taken to far and dangerous heights by the Shī'ah, the result of which is that on account of it, the Book of Allah — according to them — is something totally different to that which the Muslims have in their possession. Their scholars went a long way in implementing this invented principle, and the Shī'ah have concocted hundreds of narrations in which the Qur'ān is interpreted against its meaning. Sadly, they have once again attributed their lies to the twelve Imāms. These inner meanings are not based upon any principle or reliable law.

The reader will find that their interpretations of the verses of the Qur'ān are useless attempts aimed at changing this dīn, destroying its distinguishing characteristics and razing to the ground its foundations. This is how it unfolds; the commentaries of the Imāms are the essence of dīn. Subsequently, they interpreted the verses regarding kufr and shirk (disbelief and polytheism) to be related to the Wilāyah of 'Alī and his Imāmah and the verses regarding ḥalāl and ḥarām to be narrative regarding them and their enemies. In this manner, the one reading these commentaries finds a religion that is completely inconsistent with Islam. This religion is actually based upon two principles, viz. believing in the Imāmah of the Twelve Imāms and cursing and reviling their 'enemies'.

Uṣūl al-Kāfī of al-Kulaynī states:

عن محمد بن منصور قال سألت عبدا صالحا عن قول الله عز و جل قُلْ إِنَّمَا حَرَّمَ رَبِّي الْفَوَاحِشَ مَا ظَهَرَ مِنْهَا وَمَا بَطَّنَ قَالَ فَقَالَ إِنَّ الْقُرْآنَ لَهُ ظَهْرٌ وَبَطْنٌ فَجَمِيعُ مَا حَرَّمَ اللَّهُ فِي الْقُرْآنِ هُوَ الظَّاهِرُ وَالْبَاطِنُ مِنْ ذَلِكَ أَئِمَّةُ الْجَوْرِ وَجَمِيعُ مَا أَحَلَّ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى فِي الْكِتَابِ هُوَ الظَّاهِرُ وَالْبَاطِنُ مِنْ ذَلِكَ أَئِمَّةُ الْحَقِّ

Muḥammad ibn Manṣūr reports, “I asked the pious slave regarding the statement of Allah, the Most Honoured and Magnificent, ‘say, my Lord has only forbidden immoralities — what is apparent of them and what is concealed...’¹ and he replied, ‘the Qur’ān has an outward meaning and an inner meaning. All that which Allah had made impermissible in the Qur’ān is the outward meaning, and the inner meaning of that is the oppressive rulers, and all that which is declared permissible in the Qur’ān, is the outward meaning, the inner meaning of which is the just rulers.’”

This narration, which appears in one of their four most authentic books affirms the principle that the Qur’ān has inner meanings which have absolutely no link or relation to the outward meanings. This narration goes on to demonstrate to us their application of this principle. Thus, the wholesome and pure items which were declared permissible are a reference to specific men, i.e. the twelve Imāms, and the despised and evil acts or items, which have been declared impermissible are a reference to their enemies, i.e. the rest of the Muslim rulers.

A question that we beg to ask is, ‘how is it that this interpretation is not backed by the laws that govern usage of words, the intellect or religion?’ The only possible answer to this is that it is an attempt at changing the religion of Islam, starting at its very roots and eventually calling towards freedom and lawlessness. This narration, however, does have some benefit. It contains the secret behind their claim that the Qur’ān has an outward as well as a hidden meaning.

A dilemma that gave them sleepless nights and shook the foundations of their beliefs is that there is no mention anywhere, in any way of their twelve Imāms

1 Sūrah al-A’rāf: 33

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/374, al-Nu’mānī: *al-Ghaybah* pg. 83, *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/16

or their enemies. They have unambiguously admitted that the Qur’ān has no mention of their Imāms. Thus, they assert:

لو قرئ القرآن كما انزل لالغينا مسمين

If the Qur’ān was recited the way it was revealed, we would have found specific peoples’ names.¹

Since the foundation of their religion (Imāmah) and the Imāms have not been mentioned anywhere in the Book of Allah, they invented this belief to pacify their followers and spread their religion among the gullible and ignorant ones. Then, in order to give their idea some ‘credibility’, they – as usual – forged chains of narrations by means of which they attribute this concoction to a member or two of the Ahl al-Bayt.

Their books are replete with this belief (that the inner meaning of the Qur’ān opposes the outer meaning), to the extent that it has become one of their fundamental beliefs. This is because their religion cannot even hope to survive in the absence of this belief, or that which is equivalent to it. Hence, we find that the author of *Al-Biḥār* has a chapter titled, “the Qur’ān has an outer and inner (meaning),”² under which he quoted 84 narrations — a fraction of what is quoted in his book on the subject. His introduction to this chapter, after which he quotes the narrations is:

قد مضى كثير من تلك الاخبار فى ابواب كتاب الامامة و نورد هنا مختصرا من بعضها

A great amount of these narrations have been quoted under the chapters of *Kitāb al-Imāmah* (the book on Imāmah). Here, we will list a synopsis of some of them.³

1 Refer to *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 1/13, *al-Mujallā: Al-Biḥār* 19/30, Hāshim l-Baḥrānī: *al-Burhān* pg. 22

2 *Al-Biḥār* 92/78-106

3 *ibid*

Tafsīr al-Burhān has a chapter similar to that of *Al-Biḥār*, namely, “the Qur’ān has an outer and inner meaning.”¹ The introduction of *Tafsīr al-Burhān* contains many statements which confirm this belief. It has five chapters wherein the narrations of their Imāms regarding this have been mentioned. These are only a selection from the greater amount which exists in their reliable books.² Similarly, many of their other books on tafsīr confirm this belief in their introductions. In fact it is as if this is one of the pivotal principles (of tafsīr) according to them. Among the books wherein this principle is mentioned are *Tafsīr al-Qummī*³, *al-‘Ayyāshī*⁴, *al-Ṣāfi*,⁵ etc.

Hereunder, we reproduce two of their narrations:

ان للقران ظهرا و بطنا و بطنه بطن الى سبعة ابطن

The Qur’ān has an outer and an inner. Its inner has another inner which extends up to seven inners.⁶

Jābir al-Ju‘fī reports:

سالت ابا جعفر عن شئى من تفسير القران فاجابنى ثم سالت ثانية فاجابنى بجواب اخر فقلت جعلت فداك كنت اجبت فى هذه المسئلة بجواب غير هذا قبل اليوم فقال لى يا جابر ان للقران بطنا و للبطن بطنا و ظهرا و للظهر ظهرا يا جابر و ليس شئى ابعد من عقول الرجال من تفسير القران ان الاية لتكون اولها فى شئى و اخرها فى شئى وهو كلام متصل يتصرف على وجوه

I asked Abū Ja‘far (al-Bāqir) regarding the interpretation of a portion of the Qur’ān, to which he replied. Thereafter, I asked him a second time. His reply differed from the first one, so I objected saying, “may I be sacrificed for you. Your answer today is different from your previous one.” Thereupon,

1 *Al-Burhān* 1/19

2 *Mir’āt al-Anwār* pg. 4-19

3 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/14,16

4 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 1/11

5 *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/29

6 *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/31

he said to me, “O Jābir, indeed the Qur’ān has an outer and an inner. The inner has an outer and an inner and the outer has an outer. O Jābir, there is nothing further from the intellect of man than the commentary of the Qur’ān. The beginning of a verse is regarding one thing and the end is regarding something else, but it is speech which is connected and it can be dealt with in many different ways.”¹

The texts of the Shī‘ah affirm that every verse has an outer and an inner meaning. In fact, they go further than that also, saying that every verse has seven inner meanings. Thereafter, their counting skills were corrupted, which allowed them to claim that it actually has seventy inner meanings. They have many narrations which confirm this. One of their scholars says:

لكل آية من كلام الله ظهر و بطن... بل لكل واحدة منها كما يظهر من الخبر المستفيضة سبعة بطون و سبعون بطناً

Every verse from the speech of Allah has an inner and an outer... in fact, as is apparent from many narrations, it has seven inners and seventy stomachs.²

We have no idea regarding the reality of these inners. That which they wish to establish does not exceed two ideas, viz. the Imāmah of their twelve Imāms and disparagement regarding their opposition as well as declaring them disbelievers. When this is the case, then what was the need to invent so many ‘inners’? One who studies their narrations (which promote this hidden secret creed and have taken up volumes of books) will find that they do not go beyond these two subjects. They claim:

و قد دلت احاديث متكاثرة كادت ان تكون متواترة على ان بطونها و تاويلها بل كثير من تنزيلها و تفسيرها في فضل شان السادة الاطهار... بل الحق المتبين ان اكثر ايات الفضل و الانعام و المدح و الاكرام بل كلها

1 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 1/11, *al-Barqī: al-Maḥāsīn* pg. 300, *al-Burhān fī Tafsīr al-Qur’ān* 1/20-21, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/29, *Bihār al-Anwār* 92/95, *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 18/142

2 Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sharīf: *Mīr’āt al-Anwār* pg. 3

فيهم و في اوليائهم نزلت و ان جل فقرات التوبيخ و التشنيع و التهديد و التفتيع بل جملتها في مخالفيهم و اعدائهم... ان الله عز و جل جعل جملة بطن القران في دعوة الامامة والولاية كما جعل جل ظهره في دعوة التوحيد و النبوة والرسالة

So many aḥādīth have been reported, that it is almost mutawātir that the inner of it and its interpretations, in fact the exact revelation was concerning the great position of the pure leaders... the clear truth is that most verses, or rather — all of the verses regarding virtues, rewards, praise and honour were revealed regarding them and their supporters. On the other hand, most, if not all the passages containing any reprimand, denunciation, warning or humiliation are with regards to their enemies and those who opposed them. Allah, the most honoured and magnificent made most of the inner (meaning) of the Qur’ān a call towards Imāmah and Wilāyah, just as He made most of its outer a call towards towḥīd, nubuwwah and risālah.¹

More details regarding this will appear under the topic, “most of the Qur’ān was revealed regarding them and their enemies”.

An Analysis of This View

There is no doubt that the glorious Qur’ān is a shoreless sea. The treasures of the Qur’ān, no doubt will never be depleted, and it will not cease to amaze and render one and all hopeless as far as matching it is concerned. Needless to say, there are many secrets and indications kept therein. However, all of these are governed by the meanings of the words, and they do not go against the framework of the apparent meanings.

This is where the claim of these deviants parts ways with the Qur’ān. Their interpretations, as will appear, have absolutely no link with the Qur’ān. It cannot be linked to the meanings of the words, their connotations or even their contexts. As a matter of fact, their interpretations are totally against the text of the Qur’ān.

¹ Ibid

The main objective behind it is to establish a source that supports their opposition of the Muslims, and ultimately it is used to deter people from the Book of Allah and His dīn. In a nutshell, this ‘inner’ meaning is the solvent they wish to use to dissolve the dīn of Islam.¹

Most humans, despite their languages consider the apparent meanings of statements to be the actual and intended meanings of the speaker. It is only the Shī’ah who take riddles and puzzles to be the actual form of speech. If this form of speech had to be adopted, it would be impossible to get messages across, in a manner that they could be correctly understood. It would also be impossible to have conviction regarding any belief, as riddles and puzzles and secret meanings cannot be governed by laws and structures.

Giving due thought to this doctrine will reveal to a person the danger of this ‘inner’ interpretations and approach to the Qur’ān. It takes away the meanings of words, and does not allow anyone to benefit from the speech of Allah and His Rasūl, as that which is apparent is not the intended meaning and there is no proper way in which the inner meanings can be governed. Each person will present a different meaning, as people’s minds work differently. In this way, the Shī’ah wish to destroy the entire sharī’ah, i.e. by doing away with the apparent meanings and re-interpreting them in any way that they wish to.

If these interpretations were really the meanings of the Qur’ān, it would not have been a speech that is unmatched in its eloquence. It would have simply been a riddle. However, the Arabs admitted that it was unmatched in its eloquence and they understood it by means of its outward and apparent meanings. Ibn Taymiyyah states²:

Whoever claims secret (inner) knowledge, or knowledge regarding a secret, whereas that contradicts the apparent meanings of texts, then he has erred.

1 Refer to Ibn Ḥajar: *Fath al-Bārī*: 1/216

2 *Majmū’ Fatāwā Ibn Taymiyyah*: 13/236-237

He is either an irreligious person or an ignorant deviate. As for the secret or inner meaning which opposes the known and apparent meanings, they can be seen in the claims of the Bāṭiniyyah Qarāmiṭah, who belong to the Ismāʿīliyyah, the Nuṣayriyyah and their likes. These Bāṭiniyyah interpret the following verse to be a reference to ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ:

وَكُلُّ شَيْءٍ أَحْصَيْنَاهُ فِي إِمَامٍ مُبِينٍ

... and all things We have enumerated in a clear register.¹

They interpret this verse to be a reference to Ṭalḥah and Zubayr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا:

فَقَاتِلُوا أِتْمَةَ الْكُفْرِ

... then fight the leaders of disbelief.²

This verse is, according to them, a reference to the Banu Umayyah:

وَالشَّجَرَةَ الْمَلْعُونَةَ فِي الْقُرْآنِ

the accursed tree [mentioned] in the Qur’ān.³

These interpretations which are quoted by Ibn Taymiyyah and attributed to the Bāṭiniyyah can be found verbatim among the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. The interpretation of the first verse, “...and all things We have enumerated in a clear register,”⁴ can be found in five or more narrations of theirs.⁵ They have recorded these in their most reliable works⁶, whereas there is no indication in the verse

1 Sūrah Yā Sīn: 12

2 Sūrah al-Towbah: 12

3 Sūrah al-Isrā: 60

4 Sūrah Yā Sīn: 12

5 Refer to Hāshim al-Baḥrānī: *al-Lawāmi’ al-Nūrāniyyah fī Asmā’ ‘Alī wa Ahl Baytihi al-Qur’āniyyah* pg. 321-323

6 Amongst them are *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/212, Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī: *Ma’ānī al-Akhbār* pg. 95, Hāshim al-Baḥrānī: *Tafsīr al-Burhān* 4/6-7, al-Kāshānī: *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 4/247, *Tafsīr al-Shibr* pg. 416

towards this interpretation.¹ Similarly, the interpretation regarding the second verse (... then fight the leaders of disbelief) is also found in many of their reliable books², with more than eight narrations to support it.³ The interpretation of the third verse (the accursed tree [mentioned] in the Qur'ān) mentioned by Ibn Taymiyyah, according to the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah, is supported by a minimum of twelve narrations.⁴ He then quoted a bunch of these interpretations from their reliable sources.⁵

We found many more interpretations of this type, some of which were more severe than this. However, at this point, our object is to highlight the fact, which was mentioned by the scholars of Islam, that the interpretations of the Bāṭiniyyah have now been inherited by the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah. They have even become part of their methodology. The scholars of Islam have always objected to this type of interpretations, as “whoever interprets the Qur'ān against its known interpretation, which has been passed down from the Ṣaḥābah and Tābi'īn has lied against Allah and disbelieved in the verse of Allah. He has distorted words from their proper places. This is the door to disbelief in the name of Islam. The falsehood thereof is well-known and obvious in Islam.”⁶

The false 'inner' interpretations which were found by the scholars of Islam are only a fraction of that which the present day publishing houses of Tehran and Najaf are bringing to the fore. However, there is almost nothing different or new in these interpretations which were carried out by deceivers and liars (who have

1 The pious predecessors have explained the meaning of this verse saying, 'clear register' here refers to Umm al-Kitāb. The entire universes' happenings are recorded in a protected book called *al-lowḥ al-Mahfūz*. Refer to *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 3/591

2 *Al-Burhān* 2/106-107, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 2/324, *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī* 2/77-78, *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/283

3 Refer to the above quoted references.

4 Refer to *al-Burhān* 2/424-425

5 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/21, *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī* 2/297, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 3/199-202, *al-Burhān* 2/424-425, *Tafsīr Shibr* pg. 284, *Muqtabas al-Athar (Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-Shī'iyyah)* 20/21

6 *Al-Fatāwā* 13/143

not yet put a stop to their evil). They have interpreted many verses of the Qur'ān in this manner of inner and secret meanings, claiming that the glorious Qur'ān was revealed regarding them and their enemies. This will become abundantly clear under the discussion of the next issue.

b) Their Belief that Most of the Qur'ān was Revealed Regarding them and Their Enemies

The Shī'ah claim, “most of the Qur'ān was revealed regarding them (the twelve Imāms), their supporters and their enemies.”¹ If anyone were to search through the Book of Allah and use all the different dictionaries of Arabic, he will not even find in the Qur'ān one of the names of these Imāms. Despite that, their scholar, al-Baḥrānī claims that ‘Alī عليه السلام alone was mentioned 1154 times in the Qur'ān. Regarding this, he authored a book titled, *al-Lawāmi‘ al-Nūrāniyyah fī Asmā ‘Alī wa Ahl Baytihi al-Qur’āniyyah*². In this book, all the laws of Arabic are laid to waste. It defies all principles of reasoning and logic. Nevertheless, he has in fact disgraced his own people publicly, as all of their forgeries and meddling with the Qur'ān have been collected here from their reliable books. Perhaps if he did not do so it would not have been realised by the majority.

Some of their narrations, such as this one, expose them:

ان القرآن نزل اربع ارباع: ربع حلال و ربع حرام و ربع سنن و احكام و ربع خبر ما كان قبلكم و نبا ما يكون بعدكم و فصل ما بينكم

The Qur'ān was revealed in four quarters; a quarter is regarding the permissible, another quarter is regarding the impermissible, the third quarter is regarding mannerisms and laws and the fourth quarter is regarding the history of the people before you, news of that which will happen after you and judgement between you.³

1 *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/24. The author of *al-Ṣāfi* made this statement under the title of his second introduction.

2 This book has been printed by al-Maṭba‘ah al-‘Ilmiyyah – Qum 1394 A.H.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 2/627

Does this narration not reveal to us that there is no mention (at least in an explicit manner) of the Imāms in the Qur'ān?

However, another narration of theirs divides the Qur'ān differently. As if they realised the slip-up in the previous narration, they tried to cover up by dedicating a portion (one third) to the Imāms and their enemies. However, they sufficed upon one third (unlike their other claim that most of the Qur'ān is regarding this). The narration states:

نزل القرآن اثلاثا: ثلث فينا و في عدونا و ثلث سنن و امثال و ثلث فرائض و احكام

The Qur'ān was revealed in thirds; on third regarding us and our enemies, one third regarding mannerisms and parables and one third duties and commands.¹

A third narration appears which increases the portion of the Imāms and their enemies from one third to half. The narration states:

نزل القرآن على اربعة ارباع: ربع فينا و ربع في عدونا و ربع سنن و امثال و ربع فرائض و احكام

The Qur'ān was revealed in quarters: quarter regarding us, quarter regarding our enemies, quarter regarding mannerisms and parables and quarter regarding duties and laws.²

It should be noted that until here, the Imāms have no extra merit over their enemies as far as the portion that was dedicated to them. This gave birth to a fourth narration, (thanks to some Shī'ī who realised this) which is identical to the above narration except that it contains the following addition:

و لنا كرائم القرآن

The best portion of the Qur'ān is regarding us.³

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 2/627, *al-Burhān* 1/21, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/24, *al-Lawāmi'* *al-Nūrāniyyah* pg. 6

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 2/627, *al-Burhān* 1/21

3 *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī* 1/9, *Tafsīr Furāt* 1,2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/305, *al-Karājī*: *Kanz al-Fawā'id* pg. 2, *al-Burhān* 1/21, *al-Lawāmi'* *al-Nūrāniyyah* pg. 7

The author of *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* indicates towards this saying:

وزاد العياشى ولنا كرائم القرآن

Al-‘Ayyāshī added, “the best portion of the Qur’ān is regarding us.”¹

In this way, they ended up claiming that most of the Qur’ān was revealed regarding them and their enemies.

Their scholar, al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī (the author of *Al-Wāfi* — which is one of their canonical sources in ḥadīth) says:

وردت اخبار جمعة عن اهل البيت فى تاويل كثير من آيات القرآن بهم و باوليائهم و باعدائهم حتى ان جماعة من اصحابنا صنفوا كتباً فى تاويل القرآن على هذا النحو جمعوا فيها ما ورد عنهم فى تاويل القرآن اية اية اما بهم او بشيعتهم او بعدوهم على ترتيب القرآن و قد رايت منها كتاباً كاد يقرب من عشرين الف بيت و قد روى فى الكافى و فى تفسير العياشى و على بن ابراهيم القمى و التفسير المسموع من ابي محمد الزكى اخباراً كثيرة من هذا القبيل

Many narrations have been reported from the Ahl al-Bayt in which the verses of the Qur’ān are interpreted to be reference to them, their followers and their enemies. This is to the extent that some of our scholars have authored books in which the Qur’ān is interpreted in this manner. They gathered all that which was narrated from them regarding the interpretation of the Qur’ān, verse by verse. Each referring either to them, their supporters or their enemies, according to the order of the Qur’ān. I saw one book which would fill almost twenty rooms. Many such narrations have been reported in *al-Kāfi*, *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī*, ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī and the *Tafsīr* which was heard from Abū Muḥammad al-Zakī.²

This is a testimony or confession from one of their luminaries which confirms the degree to which this belief is common and widespread amongst them. It is

1 *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/24

2 Al-Kāshānī: *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/24-25

now an accepted principle in their reliable books of tafsīr, as well as their most authentic books of ḥadīth. In this manner, they have turned the Book of Allah away from its meanings and done away with its revealed form. They have turned it into a book which is quite different to that which is in the possession of the rest of the Muslims.

This is the primary principle according to them. One of their scholars asserts:

ان الاصل في تنزيل آيات القرآن... انما هو الارشاد الى ولاية النبي و الائمة صلوات الله عليهم بحيث لا
خير خبر به الا وهو فيهم و في اتباعهم و عارفهم ولا سوء ذكر فيه الا وهو صادق على اعدائهم و في
مخالفهم

The foundational principle regarding the revelation of the verses of the Qur’ān... it is only guidance regarding the Wilāyah of Nabī ﷺ and the Imāms. There is no goodness that was conveyed except that it is applicable to them, their supporters and those who know them and there is no mention of evil except that it is applicable to their enemies and opponents.¹

Thus, it is not surprising to see their scholars competing with one another in changing the verses of the glorious Qur’ān and twisting it to suit this principle.

Their scholar, al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī has a chapter in his book *Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah fī Uṣūl al-A’immah* regarding this, which is “all the verses in the Qur’ān regarding the permissible and impermissible are as intended by their apparent meaning and their inner meaning is regarding the Imāms of justice and oppression.”² Thus, he considers all the verses of permissibility to be a reference to the Imāms and all the verses regarding impermissibility of acts or objects to be a reference to the leaders of the Muslims (besides Imām ‘Alī and the rest of the twelve Imāms). This, undoubtedly opens the door to lawlessness, which is upheld by sects of the Bāṭiniyyah. However, he considers this to be a principle of the Imāms.

1 Abu al-Ḥasan al-Sharīf: *Mir’āt al-Anwār* (the introduction to *al-Burhān*) pg. 4. Also refer to *al-Lawāmi’ al-Nūrāniyyah* pg. 548

2 *Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah fī Uṣūl al-A’immah* pg. 256

Al-Kāfī — the most authentic book according to them — contains many narrations regarding this. It will suffice you to read, “the chapter in which there are fine points and anecdotes of the revelation, regarding Wilāyah”. The reader will be shocked to find ninety-one narrations which he gathered in this chapter, by means of which he changed the true meaning of the Qur’ān.¹ This is only one of a few chapters in which this was done.² Each chapter contains tens of narrations which convert the Qur’ān into a Shī’ah. It is left with no content besides information about the twelve Imāms, their followers and their enemies.

The book *Al-Biḥār*, which is considered one of their reliable ḥadīth sources, contains many narrations which are of the level of rules and principles of tafsīr according to them. Many narrations have been quoted here, all of which have this approach towards the Book of Allah. One only has to read the titles of a few of these chapters to realise the degree to which they are inconsistent with the Arabic language, the intellect and the basic principles of Islam. They will leave the reader convinced that this is indeed among the most severe forms of disbelief in the Book of Allah and corruption of its meanings. We will present one of these types of titles below. Al-Majlisī says:

باب تاويل المؤمنين و الايمان و المسلمین و الاسلام بهم و بولايتهم عليهم السلام و الكفار و المشركين
و الكفر و الشرك و الجبت و الطاغوت و اللات و العزى و الاصنام باعدائهم و مخالفيتهم

Chapter: Interpreting the words Mu’minīn, īmān, Muslims and Islam to mean them and their Wilāyah, and the words kuffār, mushrikīn, kufr, shirk, *jibt* (false objects of worship), *ṭāghūt* (devil), *al-Lāt* (name of an idol), *al-‘Uzzā* (name of an idol) and idols to be a reference to their enemies and opposition.³

One hundred narrations have been quoted in this chapter.

¹ *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/412

² E.g. “The Imams عليهم السلام are the signs which Allah mentioned in His book,” “the signs which are mentioned by Allah in his book are the Imams,” “the Ahl al-Dhikr (those who Allah instructed the masses to refer their questions to), are the Imams,” etc. *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/206, 207, 210.

³ *Biḥār al-Anwār* 23/354-390

باب انهم عليهم السلام الابرار و المتقون و السابقون المقربون و شيعتهم اصحاب اليمين و اعدائهم
الفجار و الاشرار و اصحاب الشمال

Chapter: They are the righteous ones, the pious, the fore-runners and the ones who have been drawn close, and their Shī'ah are the people of the right and their opponents are the transgressors, the evil ones and the people of the left.¹

Twenty five narrations have been quoted in this chapter.

باب انهم عليهم السلام وولايتهم العدل والمعروف و الاحسان و القسط والميزان و ترك ولايتهم و
اعدائهم الكفر و الفسوق و العصيان و الفحشاء والمنكر و البغى

Chapter: They and their Wilāyah are referred to as justice, righteousness, virtue, fairness and the scale, and their enemies are referred to as kufr, transgression, sin, immorality, evil and oppression.²

This chapter contains fourteen of their narrations.

There are many other chapters like this, as will be presented. They will reveal an attempt that was directed towards changing the dīn of Islam, as all the realities of Islam were modified and confined to the pledge of allegiance to one man. The meanings of shirk as far as worshipping Allah, kufr, ṭāghūt, idols, etc., have been changed to weird meanings which expose the agenda of the one who were behind all of these concoctions.

This is because, they have considered all the Muslim leaders — with the exception of the twelve Imāms — from Abū Bakr up until the last ruler before the Day of Judgement to be the enemies of the Imāms. Furthermore, all those who pledge allegiance to these leaders, starting from the Ṣaḥābah, are of their enemies, upon whom the words kufr and shirk can be used. This will appear under the discussion of Imāmah.

1 Ibid 24/1-9

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/187-191

What happens to all the tenets and principles of Islam? What happens to its laws? Are all of them now confined to Imāmah? Shirk, kufr and idols are no longer abhorred, as there is no shirk or kufr except believing in another Imām or rejecting the Imāmah of one of the twelve, as established by these narrations. Is this not the greatest form of irreligiousness and disbelief? Can any bigoted enemy plan a greater attack than this? The ideas propagated are no doubt that of an ignorant person, as is apparent from the extent of its incongruity. However, a Muslims amazement has no limits regarding this; how does a nation (of millions) remain mentally enslaved and imprisoned to such preposterous and outrages beliefs?

We continue with our presentation of the chapter heading from *Al-Biḥār*. The author says:

باب انهم الصلاة والزكاة والحج والصيام و سائر الطاعات و اعدائهم الفواحش والمعاصي

Chapter: They are ṣalāh, zakāh, ḥajj, fasting and all other acts of obedience, and their enemies are immorality and sins.¹

This chapter contains seventeen narrations.

This belief is identical to the belief of the Bāṭiniyyah, who “interpret the commands of sharī‘ah and the prohibitions thereof against that which is common knowledge to the Muslims. They are known to one and all to be lies, false attributions to the ambiyā’ and adulteration of the speech of Allah, as well as disbelief in His verses.”² The author of *Al-Biḥār* continues to present to us the true colours of the religion of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah, by means of the chapters. This is because he wrote his book during the rule of the Safavids, when taqiyyah was — to some degree — discarded. He writes:

1 Ibid 24/286-304

2 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Ibn Taymiyyah* 3/29

باب انهم عليهم السلام آيات الله و بيناته و كتابه...

Chapter: They are the signs of Allah, His proofs and His book.

This chapter contains twenty narrations.¹

باب انهم السبع المثاني

Chapter: They are the seven oft-repeated verses.

This chapter contains ten narrations.²

باب انهم عليهم السلام الصافون و المسبحون و صاحب المقام المعلوم و حملة عرش الرحمان و انهم
السفرة الكرام البررة

Chapter: They are the ones who stand in rows, the ones who glorify, the people of the known station, the carriers of the throne of al-Raḥmān and the noble and righteous scribes.

This chapter contains eleven narrations.³

باب انهم كلمات الله

Chapter: They are the words of Allah.

This chapter contains twenty five narrations.⁴

باب انهم حرمت الله

Chapter: They are the sanctified (objects) of Allah.

This chapter contains six narrations.⁵

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 23/206-211

2 *Ibid* 24/114-118

3 *Ibid* 24/87-91

4 *Ibid* 24/173-184

5 *Ibid* 24/185-186

باب انهم الذكر و اهل الذكر

Chapter: They are al-Dhikr (the reminder) and the people of al-Dhikr.

This chapter contains sixty five narrations.¹

باب انهم انوار الله

Chapter: They are the lights of Allah.

This chapter contains forty-two narrations.²

باب انهم خير امة و خير ائمة اخرجت للناس

Chapter: They are the best nation and the best leaders, selected for mankind.

This chapter contains twenty four narrations.³

باب انهم المظلومون

Chapter: They are the oppressed ones.

This chapter contains twenty seven narrations.⁴

باب انهم المستضعفون

Chapter: They are the ones who were taken to be weak.

This chapter contains thirteen narrations.⁵

1 Ibid 23/172-188

2 Ibid 23/304-188

3 Ibid 24/153-158

4 Ibid 24/221-231

5 Ibid 24/167-173

باب انهم اهل الاعراف الذين ذكرهم الله فى القرآن

Chapter: They are the people of A'rāf (partitions) who have been mentioned in the Qur'ān.

This chapter contains twenty narrations.¹

باب تاويل الوالدين والولد والارحام و ذوى القربى بهم

Chapter: Interpreting parents, the child, relatives and close family to be a reference to them.

This chapter contains twenty three narrations.²

So, the Imāms, as you have seen in these chapter headings, are at times angels, at times heavenly books and at times divine illumination. Despite that, they are also oppressed and taken to be weak. These are claims that need no analysis. Their absurdity and contradiction to the usage of words as well as the intelligence is self-evident. There is no need to even discuss them in the light of the principles and laws of Islam. In fact, they contradict one another. As if all of this was not enough, he continues, now interpreting inanimate bodies to be the Imāms. He says:

باب انهم الماء المعين والبئر العطلة والقصر المشيد و تاويل السحاب و المطر و الظل و الفواكه و سائر المنافع بعلمهم و بركاتهم

Chapter: They are the sweet water, the destroyed well, the magnificent palace. The interpretation of clouds, rain, shade, fruits and all other objects which give off benefit is their knowledge and their blessings.

This chapter contains twenty one narrations, which were selected (as usual) from a few of their reliable books.³

1 Ibid 24/247-256

2 Ibid 23/257-272

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/100-110

He then exceeds all limits. He does not even spare the qualities of Allah. He writes:

باب انهم جنب الله و روحه و يد الله و امثالها

Chapter: They are the side of Allah, His soul, His hand and all similar (descriptions).

This chapter contains thirty six narrations.¹

He then makes them the Ka'bah and the Qiblah. He has a chapter heading which reads:

باب انهم رضى الله عنهم حزب الله و بقيته و كعبته و قبلته و ان الاثارة من العلم علم الاوصياء

Chapter: They are the group of Allah, His vicegerents, His Ka'bah² and His Qiblah. The 'trace of knowledge' is the knowledge of the Awṣiyā.

He presents seven narrations in this chapter.³

His extremism continues and becomes apparent in a few more chapter headings. These are actually the most profound refutations and condemnations of the Shī'ī sect. He is in fact demolishing their foundations on the one hand, and demonstrating the grandeur of Islam on the other hand, as the reality of something becomes clear when its opposite is seen. If bitterness did not exist, none would appreciate a sweet taste. These interpretations can only be compared to the efforts of Musaylamah — the imposter. They themselves announce that

1 Ibid 24/191-203

2 The Bohras (Ismā'īlis of India and Yemen who go for Ḥajj due to them believing that the Ka'bah is a symbol of Imām 'Alī — *Islām bilā Madh-hab* pg 240) could have adopted this form of disbelief on account of these types of narrations, as the Rawāfiḍ are the door and pathway to the extremisms of the Bāṭiniyyah.

3 *Al-Biḥār* 24/211-213

they are not from Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. One who has the slightest knowledge of the Arabic language will be able to confirm this, over and above scrutinising them in the light of the laws and principles of Islam. This is because Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى revealed the Qur'ān in clear Arabic.

The book *Al-Bihār* (which is highly reliable according to the Shī'ah) wishes to turn the Imāms into everything that is mentioned in the Qur'ān. Thus, he continues listing these chapters, hoping to establish whatever his whims and fanaticism leads him to. He ends up disgorging all that was kept in his heart, without caring in the least about the embarrassment of being exposed, and without hesitating to display his insolence. He says:

باب انهم البحر و اللؤلؤ و المرجان

Chapter: They are the sea, pearls and corals.

This chapter contains seven narrations.¹

So, are they inanimate objects, or is this some secret code of theirs? They are not inanimate, as he titles another chapter:

باب انهم الناس

Chapter: They are humanity.

This chapter contains merely three narrations.²

In this chapter, he establishes that, besides the Imāms, no one else belongs to the human race. Thereafter, he continues to propagate his weird and absurd religion, which the scholars of the past did not consider to be the religion of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah, but rather the religion of the Bāṭiniyyah.³ He adds a chapter:

1 *Al-Bihār* 24/97-99

2 *Ibid* 24/94-96

3 Some of their scholars have stated that their religion is changed and modified in every era, as will be discussed under the chapter, "present day Shī'ah and their relationship with their predecessors".

A unique chapter in interpreting the bee to be a reference to them.

This chapter contains seven narrations.¹

Another chapter heading reads:

Chapter: Interpreting days and months to be the Imāms.

This chapter contains four narrations.²

If we go on to quote all the aḥādīth of those chapters, and thereafter scrutinise and analyse them, we will need a few volumes. Also, we have opted to quote the chapter headings instead of the narrations, so it cannot be said that we are taking them to task on the basis of rare narrations. Similarly, we will quote, as examples, some narrations from these chapters which will be — in most cases — narrations which are mentioned in many of their reliable books. The above-quoted chapter headings are a few from the many that are mentioned in their books. They also appear in their outstanding encyclopaedia on ḥadīth, *Al-Biḥār* — which was described by their contemporary scholars as:

The most comprehensive book on the sciences of ḥadīth.³

A more comprehensive book was neither compiled before it, nor after it.⁴

وقد صار مصدرا لكل من طلب بابا من ابواب علوم ال محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم

It has become a reference book for all those who seek any chapter from the chapters of knowledge of the household of Muḥammad ﷺ.⁵

1 *Al-Biḥār* 24/110-113

2 *Ibid* 24/238-243

3 Muḥsin al-Amīn: *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1/293

4 Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭehrānī: *Al-Dharī'ah* 3/26

5 *Ibid* 3/26-27

هو المرجع الوحيد في تحقيق معارف المذهب

It is the only source as far as researching the intricacies of the madh-hab is concerned.¹

As for the author of the book, he is, according to them:

Shaykh al-Islām wa l-Muslimīn.²

رئيس الفقهاء والمحدثين اية الله في العالمين ملاذ المحدثين في كل الاعصار و معاذ المجتهدين في جميع الاعصار

The leader of the jurists and muḥaddithīn. The sign of Allah in the universe. The source of delight for the muḥaddithīn of every era, and the source of refuge for the mujtahids of every era.³

They have bestowed upon him other titles as well.

These narrations are actually sourced from some of their reliable books, as he states:

اجتمع عندنا بحمد الله سوى الكتب الاربعة نحو مائتي كتاب و لقد جمعناها في بحار الانوار

All praise is due to Allah, besides the four books⁴, we have as many as two hundred books. I have gathered this in *Biḥār al-Anwār*.⁵

The author of *Al-Dharīʿah* says:

و اكثر ماخذ البحار من الكتب المعتمدة والاصول المعتمدة

Most of the sources of *Al-Biḥār* are authentic books and reliable sources.⁶

1 Al-Bahbūdī: *Muqaddimah Al-Biḥār* pg. 19

2 Al-Ardabīlī: *Jāmi' al-Ruwāt* 2/78

3 *Muqaddimah Al-Biḥār* pg. 29

4 *Al-Kāfi*, *Al-Tahdhīb*, *Al-Istibṣār* and *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh*. Details regarding these books will appear under the discussion, “their beliefs regarding the Sunnah”.

5 *I'tiqādāt al-Majlisī* pg. 24 (quoted from the book *al-Fikr al-Shīʿī* by Muṣṭafā al-Shībī pg. 61)

6 *Al-Dharīʿah* 3/26-27

As I have explained previously, whoever has any knowledge regarding the Arabic language, he will immediately realise that these chapters and their narrations are a great form of disbelief in the Book of Allah. It is undoubtedly adulteration of the Speech of Allah. They can only be accepted by one who is clueless regarding both, Arabic as well as Islam. It is also clear proof that the one who wishes to temper with the Book of Allah is severely disgraced. These absurdities are not confined to their ḥadīth books. Rather, if a person reads the highly celebrated Tafsīr of theirs, which is referred to as “The mother of all Tafsīrs”¹ (*Tafsīr al-Qummī*) by them, he will find a fair share of Bāṭinī interpretations.

Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī, one of their classical and reliable commentaries, is no different. The same can be said regarding *Tafsīr al-Burhān*, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* and others, which supposedly rely upon that which is reported from Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq or one of the other Imāms for their interpretations. If we wish to study and analyse each book of tafsīr independently, the subject will be lengthened extensively and it will be a prolonged digression. It will suffice us to mention a few of their narrations of these chapters.

The Origin of These Interpretations, Their Roots and a Few Examples

Their Origin

The claim of the Shī‘ah that the Qur’ān cannot be used as proof unless it is accompanied by one who keeps it in place has already been discussed. He has to be one of the twelve, and he has all the knowledge of the Qur’ān, an accolade that is shared with him by none. Furthermore, he was granted the duty of the law-maker, by specifying texts which were general, adding conditions to some of them from his own side, choosing a meaning for those which had more than one implication and abrogating those which he wished to abrogate. This is because all the matters of religion were handed over to him.

1 *Aṣl Uṣūl al-Tafsīr*, refer to the introduction of *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/16

Thereafter, they proved the necessity of having the one who keeps it in place by stating, “the Qur’ān has inner meanings which contradict the apparent ones.” Then, this treasure of knowledge, which was guarded by the twelve Imāms was finally revealed to be a reference to them (the Imāms) and their enemies (the Ṣaḥābah and those who followed diligently in their footsteps). Most of the discussions in the Qur’ān (according to them) do not go beyond this topic. Finally, these ideas needed to become a reality. Thus, the scholars of the Shī‘ah rose to the occasion by fabricating hundreds of narrations to twist the meanings of the Qur’ān, so that they could claim that it is a reference to the Imāms, their opponents or any other doctrine which is upheld by them alone, and it is in stark contradiction to the beliefs of the majority.

It is the opinion of one of the orientalists¹ that the first book which set this trend in tafsīr for the Shī‘ah, is a book that was written in the second century after the hijrah by Jābir al-Ju‘fī.²

Some of the scholars of the Shī‘ah have indicated towards this Tafsīr³, and it was — as indicated by some of their narrations — something that was spread and passed on secretly. Al-Kashshī reports from Mufaḍḍal ibn ‘Umar al-Ju‘fī:

1 Goldziher: Muhammedanische Studien pg. 303-404

2 Jābir ibn Yazīd ibn al-Ḥārith al-Jū‘fī al-Kūfī. (d. 127 A.H.) Ibn Ḥibbān says, “he was a Saba‘ī, from the companions of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’. He would say that ‘Alī will return to this world.” Al-‘Uqaylī reports with his isnād from Zā‘idah who says, “Jābir al-Ju‘fī is a Rāfiḍī who reviles the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.” Al-Nasā‘ī and others have stated that he is unreliable. Yaḥyā said, “his narrations should not be written and he has no dignity.” Ibn Ḥajar says, “he is an unreliable Rāfiḍī,” refer to *Mizān al-I’tidāl* 1/379-380, *Taqrīb Al-Tahdhīb* 1/123, *al-Ḍu‘afā lī l-‘Uqaylī* 1/191-196.

The views regarding him in the books of the Shī‘ah are contradictory. Some suggest that he is the one who possessed all the knowledge of the Ahl al-Bayt. They generously grant him super-human attributes such as knowledge of the unseen, etc. On the other hand, there are views wherein he is criticised. However, they interpret the views wherein he is criticised as Taqiyyah, and they regard him to be reliable, as is their habit regarding those who share their views, even if he was the greatest liar. Refer to *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 20/51, *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 191, *Jāmi‘ al-Ruwāt* 1/144. Read up the details under the chapter, “their beliefs regarding the Sunnah”.

3 Al-Ṭūsī/*al-Fahrist* pg. 70, Āghā Buzurg/*Al-Dharī‘ah* 4/268, al-‘Āmilī/*A’yān al-Shī‘ah* 1/196

سالت ابا جعفر عليه السلام عن تفسير جابر فقال لا تحدث به السفلة فيذيعوه

I asked Abū Ja‘far عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام regarding the *Tafsīr* of Jābir. He replied, “do not inform the lowly ones of it, as they might spread it.”¹

One can find many narrations spread in the books of the Shī‘ah, which have been narrated from this Jābir and attributed to Imām Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad or his father.² It is obvious that the Shī‘ah cannot find any footing or proof from the Book of Allah, except by means of these ludicrous Bāṭinī interpretations. This is why this methodology was given birth to at a very early stage.

In fact, we could say that the roots of this belief started growing on the veranda of Saba’ism, as Ibn Saba’ is the one who tried finding proof regarding his belief of reincarnation from the Qur’ān by means of an ‘inner’ interpretation. He proclaimed, “those who surprise us are the ones who believe that ‘Īsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام will return, yet they do not believe that Muḥammad صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ will return. Allah says:

إِنَّ الَّذِي فَرَضَ عَلَيْكَ الْقُرْآنَ لَرَأْدُكَ إِلَى مَعَادٍ

Indeed, [O Muḥammad], He who imposed upon you the Qur’ān will take you back to a place of return.³

Some of the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah have related to us examples of Shī‘ī interpretations of the Book of Allah. However, that which has been revealed to

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 192

2 Al-Muḥaḥḥar (one of the contemporary Shī‘ī scholars) says, ‘He reported seventy thousand aḥādīth from al-Bāqir alone. It is said that he had all the knowledge of the Imāms.’ Muḥammad al-Muḥaḥḥar/ *al-Imām al-Ṣādiq* pg. 143. However, *Rijāl al-Kashshī* (pg. 191), under the biography of Jābir al-Ju‘fī states: ‘Zurārah says, “I asked Abū ‘Abd Allah عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام regarding the aḥādīth of Jābir. He replied, ‘I have not seen him with my father except once, and he did not ever visit me.’” These are testimonies from them that prove the lies of Jābir al-Ju‘fī as far as his narrations from al-Ṣādiq and his father are concerned. Further details regarding this will appear under the chapter of the Sunnah.

3 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 85. This text is found in *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/34, *Tārīkh Ibn al-Athīr* 3/77.

us in this era, was unimaginable. It seems as if those interpretations which were attributed to the extremist Shī'ah by the scholars of Islam have been inherited by the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah. Imām al-Ash'arī¹, al-Baghdādī², al-Shahrastānī³ and others report from Mughīrah ibn Sa'īd (who the Ahl al-Sunnah as well as the Shī'ah accept as an extremist and whose sect is called al-Mughīriyyah⁴) that he interpreted the word shayṭān in the following verse to be 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ:

كَمَثَلَ الشَّيْطَانِ إِذْ قَالَ لِلْإِنْسَانِ اكْفُرْ

Like the example of Satan when he says to man, “disbelieve.”⁵

This interpretation has been narrated verbatim by the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah, and they have preserved it in their reliable sources. *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī*⁶, *al-Ṣāfi*⁷, *al-Qummī*⁸, *al-Burhān*⁹ and *Biḥār al-Anwār*¹⁰ report from Abu Ja'far (al-Bāqir) regarding the verse of Allah:

1 *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/73

2 *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg. 240

3 *Al-Milal wa l-Niḥal* 1/177

4 Al-Mughīriyyah – the followers of al-Mughīrah ibn Sa'īd. The authors on the subject of sects have counted them among the extremists Shī'ahs. Al-Mughīrah was of the view that 'Alī was god. He claimed nubuwwah, anthropomorphism and other deviant beliefs. The books of the Twelvers have narrated that the Imāms have disparaged him and cursed him. Khālid ibn 'Abd Allah al-Qisrī had the opportunity of killing him in the year 119 A.H.

Refer to *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 7/128-130, al-Ash'arī: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/69-74, al-Baghdādī: *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg. 238-242, Ibn Ḥazm: *al-Fiṣal* 5/43-44, al-Shahrastānī: *al-Milal wa l-Niḥal* pg. 176-178, Nishwān al-Ḥimyarī: *al-Ḥūr al-'Ayn* pg. 168, al-Dhahabī: *Mīzān al-'Itidāl* 4/160-162, al-Maqrīzī: *al-Khuṭaṭ* 2/353.

Also refer to these books of the Shī'ah; al-Qummī: *al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq* pg. 55, *Rijāl al-Kashshī* narrations 336, 399, 400, 909, 401, 402, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408, 511, 542, 543, 544, 549

5 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 16

6 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/223

7 *Al-Kāshānī: Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 3/84

8 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* (Refer to *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 3/84. I did not find it in my copy of *Tafsīr al-Qummī*)

9 *Al-Baḥrānī: al-Burhān* 2/309

10 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 3/378

وَقَالَ الشَّيْطَانُ لَمَّا قُضِيَ الْأَمْرُ

And Satan will say when the matter has been concluded...¹

هو الثانى و ليس فى القرآن شىء وقال الشيطان الا وهو الثانى

He is the second one. There is no place in the Qur’ān wherein it is said, “Shayṭān said,” except that it refers to the second one.

The books of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah have surpassed Mughīrah by setting this blasphemous interpretation as a standard rule. *Al-Kāfī* reports from Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq):

و كان فلان شيطاناً قال المجلسى فى شرحه على الكافى: المراد بفلان عمر

Fulān (an unnamed person) was a shayṭān.² Al-Majlisī says in his commentary of *al-Kāfī*, “the one who is referred to as *fulān* is ‘Umar.”³

These narrations, which the books of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah attribute to Abū Ja‘far al-Bāqir are in fact from the fabrications of Mughīrah ibn Sa‘īd and his likes. Al-Dhahabī reports from Kathīr al-Nawā⁴ that Abū Ja‘far (al-Bāqir) said:

برئ الله و رسوله من المغيرة بن سعيد و بيان بن سمعان فانها كذبا علينا اهل البيت

Allah and Rasūl have nothing to do with Mughīrah ibn Sa‘īd and Bayān ibn Sam‘ān. They have concocted lies using our (the Ahl al-Bayt) names.⁵

1 Sūrah Ibrāhīm: 22

2 Al-Kulaynī: *al-Kāfī* (which is printed along with *Mir’āt al-‘Uqūl* 4/416)

3 *Mir’āt al-‘Uqūl* 4/416

4 Kathīr al-Nawā: He was a Shī‘ī. It is said that he repented from being a Shī‘ī. Al-Dhahabī says, “they considered him to be unreliable. Ibn Ḥibbān was lenient regarding him.” *Al-Kāshif* 3/3

5 *Mīzān al-I’tidāl* 4/161

Al-Kashshī reports in his *Rijāl* from Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq):

لعن الله المغيرة بن سعيد كان يكذب علينا

May Allah curse Mughīrah ibn Sa‘īd, he would forge lies against us.¹

Thereafter, al-Kashshī quotes a few narrations similar to this. These narrations indicate that Mughīrah would acquire his deviant ideas from a Jewish source. *Rijāl al-Kashshī* states that Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) said one day to his companions:

لعن الله المغيرة بن سعيد و لعن يهودية كان يختلف اليها يتعلم منها السحر و الشعبة (كذا) والمخاريق

May Allah curse Mughīrah ibn Sa‘īd and may he curse the Jewish woman.
He would visit her to learn from her witchcraft, magic and sorcery.²

It is noteworthy that al-Ash‘arī, al-Baghdādī, Ibn Ḥazm and Nishwān al-Ḥimyarī all agreed that Jābir al-Ju‘fī was the first person to lay the foundations of this Bāṭinī method of tafsīr adopted by the Shī‘ah. He was the successor of Mughīrah ibn Sa‘īd³ who said that the meaning of the word shayṭān in the Qur’ān is Amīr al-Mu‘minīn Sayyidunā ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. They are components of the same poison which were led to the destruction of Shī‘ism.

A Few Examples of Shī‘ī Interpretations of the Verses of the Qur’ān

The leading Shī‘ī scholar of his time, who is referred to when the word ‘Allāmah is used without any name after it, Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, says whilst trying to prove that ‘Alī was the one who deserved to be the khalīfah:

البرهان الثلاثون قوله تعالى مَرَجَ الْبَحْرَيْنِ يَلْتَقِيَنِ ﴿١٩﴾ يَبْنَهُمَا بَرْزَخٌ لَا يَبْغِيَنِ ﴿٢٠﴾ قال
على و فاطمة يَبْنَهُمَا بَرْزَخٌ لَا يَبْغِيَنِ ﴿٢١﴾ النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم يَخْرُجُ مِنْهُمَا اللُّؤْلُؤُ وَ
الْمَرْجَانُ ﴿٢٢﴾ الحسن و الحسين

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* number 336

2 *Ibid* number 403

3 Al-Ash‘arī: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/73, al-Baghdādī: *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg. 242, Ibn Ḥazm: *al-Muḥallā* 5/44, Nishwān: *al-Ḥūr al-Ayn* pg. 168

The thirtieth proof: The statement of Allah, “He released the two seas, meeting [side by side]. Between them is a barrier [so] neither of them transgresses,” they are ‘Alī and Fāṭimah. “Between them is a barrier [so] neither of them transgresses,” this refers to Nabī ﷺ. “From both of them emerge pearl and coral,” this refers to Ḥasan and Ḥusayn.

When Ibn Muṭahhar tried using this as proof, Ibn Taymiyyah stated:

Indeed this, and all those arguments similar to it can only emerge from one who does not understand that which he articulates. It is closer to being a mockery, than being a commentary of the Qur’ān. It is from the interpretations of the irreligious and the Qarāmiṭah Bāṭiniyyah. In fact it is worse than many of their interpretations. This kind of commentary is the pathway towards disbelieving in the Qur’ān and finding fault with it. This is undoubtedly the greatest form of insults to the Qur’ān.¹

I wonder what his reaction would be if he had to see all that which is preserved in *al-Kāfī*, *Al-Bihār*, *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī*, *al-Qummī*, *al-Burhān*, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* and others. I have in front of me a huge collection of this type of drivel. Quoting them would require volumes.² They are truly a scary amount of narrations. The Shī’ah have been deprived of the illumination and guidance of the Qur’ān.

Towḥīd, which was at the core of the call of the ambiyā’ and the crux of their mission is interpreted by them to be the Wilāyah of the Imām. They narrate from Abū Ja’far (al-Bāqir):

ما بعث الله نبيا قط الا بولايتنا والبراءة من عدونا و ذلك قول الله في كتابه وَلَقَدْ بَعَثْنَا فِي كُلِّ أُمَّةٍ رَّسُولًا
أَنِ اعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ وَ اجْتَنِبُوا الطَّاغُوتَ

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/66

2 I prepared a table of these interpretations wherein I presented their subjects in alphabetical order. Under each subject, I listed the amount of places that this is repeated in the Book of Allah along with the interpretations of the Shī’ah in these places. This table ended up being really large. However my superior was of the opinion — and I agreed with him — that there is no need for it, as that which has been mentioned thus far is sufficient (on account of methodological reasons).

Allah did not send any Nabī except with (the message of) our Wilāyah and denouncing our enemies. This is established from the statement of Allah, “and We certainly sent into every nation a Rasūl, [saying], ‘worship Allah and avoid Ṭāghūt.’”^{1,2}

They have many narrations under this chapter, as will appear.

The word *ilāh* (deity) is the Imām. Have a look at the interpretation of this verse:

لَا تَتَّخِذُوا إِلَٰهَيْنِ اثْنَيْنِ ۚ إِنَّمَا هُوَ إِلَٰهٌ وَاحِدٌ ۚ

Do not take for yourselves two deities. He is but one deity.³

Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) says, as they allege:

يعنى بذلك و لا تتخذوا امامين انما هو امام واحد

What is meant is do not take two Imāms, there is only one Imām.⁴

“Rabb” also refers to the Imāms according to them. They could have got away with this one, as the word Rabb is used for other meanings as well, such as *rabb al-bayt* (the owner of the house) and *rabb al-māl* (the owner of the money). However, they chose to interpret it in this way in such verses which are definitely referring to Allah alone. They interpret the verse wherein Allah speaks about the mushrikīn:

وَيَعْبُدُونَ مِن دُونِ اللَّهِ مَا لَا يَنْفَعُهُمْ وَلَا يَضُرُّهُمْ ۚ وَكَانَ الْكَافِرُ عَلَىٰ رَبِّهِ ظَهِيرًا

But they worship rather than Allah that which does not benefit them or harm them, and the disbeliever is ever, against his Rabb, an assistant [to Satan].⁵

1 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 36

2 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/261, *al-Burhān* 2/373, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 3/134, *Tafsīr Nūr al-Thaqalayn* 3/60

3 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 51

4 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/261, *al-Burhān* 2/373, *Tafsīr Nūr al-Thaqalayn* 3/60

5 Sūrah al-Furqān: 55

Al-Qummī says in his *Tafsīr*:

الكافر: الثاني كان على أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام ظهيرا

The second kāfir (referring to ‘Umar رضي الله عنه) was an assistant against Amīr al-Mu‘minīn.¹

Thus, he took Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Alī to be the Rabb. Al-Kāshānī reports in *al-Baṣā’ir*² that al-Bāqir عليه السلام was asked regarding its meaning, to which he replied:

ان تفسيرها فى بطن القرآن على هو ربه فى الولاية والرب هو الخالق الذى لا يوصف

The interpretation according to the inner meaning of the Qur’ān is that ‘Alī is his Rabb in Wilāyah and the Rabb is the creator who is beyond description.³

This is a definite lie, as the verse is regarding Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. The author of *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* tries to do away with this matter, so he explained this verse in the following manner:

يعنى ان الرب على الاطلاق الغير المقيد بالولاية هو الخالق جل شانه

Wherever the word Rabb is used without the word Wilāyah added to it, it refers to the Creator...⁴

However, the wording of the verse does not support his claim, as the word Rabb therein did not have the word Wilāyah after it. Thus it could only refer to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. Furthermore, there is no indication due to which the word should be

1 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/115

2 *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* by their scholar al-Ṣaffār.

3 Take note of their disbelief in the attributes of Allah in this quotation, as will be expounded upon. Refer to it in *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 4/20, *al-Burhān* 3/172, *Tafsīr Nūr al-Thaqalayn* 4/25, *Mir’āt al-Anwār* pg. 59

4 *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 4/20, *Mir’āt al-Anwār* pg. 59

interpreted against its meaning. It is for this reason that some of the predecessors said regarding its interpretation, “the kāfir was a helper of shayṭān against his Rabb, and he helped him to disobey Him.”¹

Regarding the verse of Allah:

وَأَشْرَقَتِ الْأَرْضُ بِنُورِ رَبِّهَا

And the earth will shine with the light of its Rabb.²

The mufasssirīn have stated:

The earth will be lit on the Day of Qiyāmah when Allah’s manifestation takes place for the creation when he will judge.³

However, the leading mufasssir, according to the Shī’ah (Ibrāhīm al-Qummī) reports with his chain from Mufaḍḍal ibn ‘Umar that he heard Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) saying regarding the verse:

وَأَشْرَقَتِ الْأَرْضُ بِنُورِ رَبِّهَا

And the earth will shine with the light of its Rabb.⁴

رب الارض يعنى امام الارض فاذا خرج يكون ماذا قال اذا يستغنى الناس عن ضوء الشمس و نور القمر و يجتزون كذا بنور الامام

The Rabb of the earth refers to the Imam of the earth. I asked, “so when he emerges, what will happen?” He replied, “then, people will no longer need the light of the sun and moon. They will take guidance from the light of the Imām.”⁵

1 *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 19/26-27, *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 3/338

2 *Sūrah al-Zumar*: 69

3 *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 4/70

4 *Sūrah al-Zumar*: 69

5 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/253, *al-Burhān* 4/87, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 4/331

They interpret the verses regarding the attributes of Allah to be a reference to the Imāms. As an example, they say:

ان الاخبار المستفيضة تدل على تاويل وجه الله بالائمة عليهم السلام

A large amount of narrations indicate that the interpretation of the face of Allah is the Imāms.¹

Obviously, these can only be Shī'ī narrations. Al-Majlisī mentioned many of these narrations under a chapter which he titled:

باب انهم جنب الله و روحه و يد الله و امثالها

Chapter: They are the side of Allah, His soul, His hand and all similar (descriptions).

This chapter contains thirty-six narrations.²

Does this mean that they interpret these verses to mean the Imām:

كُلُّ شَيْءٍ هَالِكٌ إِلَّا وَجْهَهُ

Everything will be destroyed except His Face.³

وَيَبْقَى وَجْهُ رَبِّكَ ذُو الْجَلَالِ وَالْإِكْرَامِ

And there will remain the Face of your Rabb, Owner of Majesty and Honour.⁴

1 *Mir'āt al-Anwār* pg. 324

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/191

3 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 88

4 Sūrah al-Raḥmān: 27

Will the Imāms remain forever? In fact will they be the only ones to remain? I did not think that their matter would be this severe, until my eyes fell upon their narrations in their books. Al-Ṣādiq says, as they claim, regarding the first verse:

نحن وجه الله

We are the face of Allah.¹

Regarding the second verse he says:

نحن وجه الله الذي يؤتى منه

We are the face of Allah from which He will be brought.²

However, the Imāms, just like all humans, were overtaken by death. Allah says:

كُلُّ مَنْ عَلَيْهَا فَانٍ

Everyone upon it [i.e., the earth] will perish.³

The author of *al-Kāfī* tried granting the Imāms of the Shī'ah a distinguishing feature as far as death was concerned. Thus he said:

ان الائمة يعلمون يموتون و لا يموتون الا باختيار منهم

The Imāms know when they will die and they do not die except by choice.⁴

1 Refer to *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/147, al-Karājīkī: *Kanz al-Fawā'id* pg. 219, Ibn Shahrāshūb: *Manāqib Āl Abī Ṭālib* 3/63, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/193, *Tafsīr Shībr* pg. 378

2 Refer to *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/345, Ibn Shahrāshūb: *Manāqib Āl Abī Ṭālib* 3/343, al-Kāshānī: *Tafsīr al-ṣāfī* 5/110 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/193

3 Sūrah a-Raḥmān: 26

4 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/258

Nonetheless, there is no doubt that death did overcome them. Also, if their death occurred in accordance to their decision and choice, then taqiyyah would not exist. Another blasphemous claim is that the Imāms are referred to when Allah speaks of the *Asmā' al-Ḥusnā* (best of names) in this verse:

وَلِلّٰهِ الْأَسْمَاءُ الْحُسْنَىٰ فَادْعُوهُ بِهَا

And to Allah belong the best names, so invoke Him by them.¹

As usual, they forged a narration from Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) that he said:

نحن والله الاسماء الحسنی الذي لا يقبل من احد الا بمعرفتنا قال فَادْعُوهُ بِهَا

By the oath of Allah, we are the best of names. (Prayers) are not accepted from anyone unless he knows us. He said, “so invoke Him by them.”²

More details will appear when the attributes of Allah will be discussed, if Allah wills. Nevertheless, these interpretations which turn the “Ilāh”, “Rabb”, “Allah” and His attributes into Imāms are the effects of the Saba’iyyah, who believe that ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was a deity. This poisonous effect has remained among the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah, and has become part of their religion. Thus, till today some scholars of this sect continue to proclaim this view.³

Rijāl al-Kashshī contains narrations which highlight the displeasure of Imām Ja‘far regarding these bāṭinī interpretations. One such narration states that it was said in the presence of Ja‘far that some Shī‘ah (as reported by al-Kashshī) opined that the Imām was referred to in the verse:

وَهُوَ الَّذِي فِي السَّمَاءِ إِلَهٌ وَفِي الْأَرْضِ إِلَهٌ

And it is He [i.e., Allah] who is [the only] deity in the heaven, and on the earth [the only] deity.⁴

1 Sūrah al-A‘rāf: 180

2 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/42, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 2/254-255, *al-Burhān* 2/51

3 Refer to the section, “present day Shī‘ah and their relationship with their predecessors,” of this book.

4 Sūrah al-Zukhruf: 84

قال هو الامام فقال ابو عبد الله لا والله لا ياوينى و اياه سقف بيت ابداهم سر من اليهود و النصارى و
المجوس و الذين اشركوا و الله ما صغر عظمة الله تصغيرهم شئ فقط...والله لو اقررت بما يقول فى اهل
الكوفة لاخذتنى الارض و ما انا الا عبد مملوك لا اقدر على شئ ضر و لا نفع

Abū ‘Abd Allah responded, “By the oath of Allah, no roof will house me or him (the one who accepted this interpretation). They are worse than the Jews, Christians, Zoroastrians and polytheists. By the oath of Allah, the grandeur of Allah has not decreased in the least by their mockery. By the oath of Allah, if I have to accept that which the people of Kūfah say, the earth will devour me. I am only a slave of my master. I have no control over any goodness or evil.¹

The Imām (who is referred to as Rabb and Ilāh by them) is also referred to as Rasūl. The author of *Mir’āt al-Anwār* says:

قد ورد تاويل الرسول بالامام و الرسل بالائمة فى بعض الايات بحيث يمكن سحبه الى غيره

The interpretation of Rasūl to mean Imām has been narrated, as well as Rusul (its plural) to mean Imāms, in some verses where the word can be applied to a meaning other than its own.²

This means that wherever the word Rasūl appears, it can be interpreted as Imām. The following text supports our understanding:

ان عمدة بعثة الرسل لاجل الولاية فيصح تاويل الرسل بما يتعلق بها

The primary reason behind sending the Rusul was Wilāyah. Therefore, it is correct to interpret Rusūl to be something to which it is related to.³

This, far from being a reason or proof behind their interpretation, is actually a mockery of Islam. Allah himself says that the primary reason behind sending them was towḥīd:

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 300

2 *Mir’āt al-Anwār* pg. 163

3 *Mir’āt al-Anwār* pg. 163

وَلَقَدْ بَعَثْنَا فِي كُلِّ أُمَّةٍ رَسُولًا أَنِ اعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ وَاجْتَنِبُوا الطَّاغُوتَ

And We certainly sent into every nation a Rasūl, [saying], “worship Allah and avoid Ṭāghūt.”¹

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ قَبْلِكَ مِنْ رَسُولٍ إِلَّا نُوحِي إِلَيْهِ أَنَّهُ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا أَنَا فَاعْبُدُونِ

And We sent not before you any Rasūl except that We revealed to him that, “there is no deity except Me, so worship Me.”²

Among the examples of their interpretation of the word Rasūl to mean Imām is that which they report from al-Ṣādiq under the commentary of the verse:

وَلِكُلِّ أُمَّةٍ رَسُولٌ

And for every nation is a messenger.³

قال اى فى كل قرن امام يدعوهم الى طريق الحق

He said, “this means that in each era there will be an Imām who will call them towards the truth.”⁴

The Imāms are also referred to as angels in the Qur’ān. Their narrations state, as they claim, that the meaning of angels in the Qur’ān is the Imāms, according to the inner interpretation. This is irrespective of whether the word ‘angels’ is used or they are referred to without mention of the word ‘angels’ such as the phrase, “those who carry the ‘Arsh,” and its likes.⁵ As explained previously, the Imāms are

1 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 36

2 Sūrah al-Ambiyā: 25

3 Sūrah Yūnus: 47

4 *Mir’āt al-Anwār* pg. 164, *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/123, *al-Burhān* 2/186, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 2/405, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/306-307

5 *Mir’āt al-Anwār* pg. 303

also the Qur’ān and they are “the Book”. *Tafsīr al-Qummī* reports from al-Ṣādiq regarding the verse:

ذَلِكَ الْكِتَابُ لَا رَيْبَ فِيهِ

This is the Book about which there is no doubt.¹

قال الكتاب على

He said, “‘the Book,’ is ‘Alī and there is no doubt regarding that.”²

The Imām is the “the word” in the following verse:

وَلَوْ لَا كَلِمَةُ الْفَضْلِ لَقَضِيَ بَيْنَهُمْ

But if not for the decisive word,³

قالوا الكلمة الامام

“The word,” is the Imam.⁴

Regarding the verse:

لَا تَبْدِيلَ لِكَلِمَاتِ اللَّهِ

No change is there in the words [i.e., decrees] of Allāh.⁵

قالوا: لا تغيير للامامة

They say, “no change is allowed in Imāmah.”⁶

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 1-2

2 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/30, *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/26, *al-Burhān* 1/53, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/91-92

3 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 21

4 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/274, *al-Burhān* 4/121, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/174

5 Sūrah Yūnus: 64

6 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/314, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/175

Their Imām, Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad says regarding the verse:

سَبْعَةُ أَبْحُرٍ مَا نَفِدَتْ كَلِمَتُ اللَّهِ

... seven [more] seas, the words of Allah would not be exhausted.¹

نحن الكلمات التي لا تدرك فضائلنا ولا تحصى

We are the words of Allah. Our virtues can neither be realised nor can they be counted.²

Their narrations regarding this are many in number. Al-Majlisī quoted twenty five of them in his *Biḥār*.³ Interpreting ‘word’ to mean Imām reflects the degree to which they borrowed beliefs from Christianity, as the Messiah عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was referred to as “the word of Allah”. However, the glaring difference between the Messiah and the Imām (عليه السلام) is that the creation of the former was similar to the creation of Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. (He created him from sand and then said to him, “Be (in existence)!” and so he was. Thus, he was created by the word of Allah.) The latter was created in a manner that was no different to the creation of the rest of humanity.⁴

The straight path is another reference to the Imām (Amīr al-Mu’minīn) according to them. Thus they believe that he is referred to⁵ in this verse:

إِهْدِنَا الصِّرَاطَ الْمُسْتَقِيمَ

Guide us to the straight path.⁶

1 Sūrah Luqmān: 27

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/174, *Tuḥaf al-Uqūl* pg. 355, Ibn Shahrāshūb: *Manāqib Āl Abī Ṭālib* 3/508, *al-Iḥtijāj* pg. 552

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/173-175

4 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/18

5 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/28, *Tafsīr al-Ayyāshī* 1/42, *al-Burhān* 1/89, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/85, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 23/211

6 Sūrah al-Fātiḥah: 6

He is also referred to as the Sun. they report from al-Ṣādiq the interpretation of the verse:

وَالشَّمْسُ وَضُحَاهَا

By the sun and its brightness.¹

قال الشمس امير المؤمنين وضحاحا قيام القائم

He said, “the Sun is Amīr al-Mu’minīn and its brightness is the appearance of al-Qā’im (their awaited Imām).”²

The Masjid, *Masājid* (plural of Masjid), Ka’bah and Qiblah are all used to refer to the Imām. They report from al-Ṣādiq regarding the verse:

وَاقِيمُوا وُجُوهَكُمْ عِنْدَ كُلِّ مَسْجِدٍ

... and that you direct yourselves [to the Qiblah] at every place [or time] of prostration,³

قال يعنى الائمة

He said, “this refers to the Imāms.”⁴

Another supposed narration from him states regarding the verse:

بَنِي آدَمَ خُذُوا زِينَتَكُمْ عِنْدَ كُلِّ مَسْجِدٍ

O children of Adam, take your adornment [i.e., wear your clothing] at every masjid,⁵

1 Sūrah al-Shams: 1

2 *Al-Burhān* 4/476, *Mir’āt al-Anwār* pg. 200, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/85, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 23/211 (One will also find the interpretation of the day to be Imāms here).

3 Sūrah al-A’rāf: 29

4 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/12, *al-Burhān* 2/8, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 2/188 *Mir’āt al-Anwār* pg. 175, *Nūr al-Thaqalayn* 2/17

5 Sūrah al-A’rāf: 31

قال يعنى الائمة

He said, “this refers to the Imāms.”¹

And regarding the verse:

وَأَنَّ الْمَسْجِدَ لِلَّهِ فَلَا تَدْعُوا مَعَ اللَّهِ أَحَدًا

And [He revealed] that the masjids are for Allāh, so do not invoke with Allah anyone.²

قال ان الامام من ال محمد فلا تتخذوا من غيرهم اماما

He said, “the Imām (must be) from the family of Muḥammad, so do not take an Imām from any other people.”³

They also claim that al-Ṣādiq said:

نحن البلد الحرام و نحن كعبة الله و نحن قبلة الله

We are the sanctified land, the Ka’bah of Allah and the Qiblah of Allah.⁴

Sujūd (prostration) is interpreted to be acceptance of the Wilāyah of the Imāms. This interpretation is applied to the verse:

وَقَدْ كَانُوا يُدْعَوْنَ إِلَى السُّجُودِ وَهُمْ سَلِيمُونَ

... and they used to be invited to prostration while they were sound.⁵

1 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/13, *al-Burhān* 2/9

2 *Sūrah al-Jinn*: 18

3 *al-Burhān* 4/393

4 *Al-Karājīkī: Kanz al-Fawā'id* pg. 2, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/303, *Mir'āt al-Anwār* pg. 213

5 *Surah al-Qalam*: 43

i.e. they used to be invited to the Wilāyah of ‘Alī in the worldly life.¹

It is perhaps narrations such as these that are the cause behind the Shī‘ah worshipping their Imāms and their tombs as well as the cause behind them frequenting the *mashāhid* (mausoleums of the Imāms) whilst abandoning the Masājid. They were made to believe that the mashāhid were in fact the Masājid and the Imām was the Ka‘bah and Qiblah of Allah. This is why they have written books such as *Manāsik al-Mashāhid* (the rites of the tombs) and *Manāsik al-Ziyārāt* or *al-Mazār*.² Special attention was accorded to explaining their virtues and the etiquettes of visiting them to the extent that these matters made up large portions of their books³, as will be explained.⁴

The meaning of the word *towbah* (repenting from sins and turning towards the obedience of Allah) was known to one and all. However, the Shī‘ah were not satisfied. Thus, they decided to interpret it to mean denouncing the Khilāfah of Abū Bakr, ‘Umar رضي الله عنه and the Banū Umayyah and emphasising the Imāmah of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. Thus, three narrations are reported regarding the interpretation of the following verse:

فَاغْفِرْ لِلَّذِينَ تَابُوا وَاتَّبَعُوا سَبِيلَكَ

... so forgive those who have repented and followed Your way.⁵

1 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/383 *al-Burhān* 4/372, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 5/214-215 *Mir’āt al-Anwār* pg. 176

2 This is a reference to books such as *Manāsik al-Ziyārāt* by al-Mufīd, *Kitāb al-Mazār* by Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Faḍl, *al-Mazār* by Muḥammad al-Mash-hadī, *al-Mazār* by Muḥammad ibn Humām, *al-Mazār* by Muḥammad ibn Ahmad. Al-‘Āmilī mentioned them in *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* and he even quoted from them. Refer to *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 20/48-49. Also refer to Ibn Taymiyyah: *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/175, *al-Fatāwā* 17/498

3 This can be seen in books such as *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*, *Al-Wāfi*, *Al-Bihār*, *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah*, etc. Further details regarding these texts as well as the texts themselves will be presented shortly.

4 Refer to the chapter regarding their beliefs as far as towḥīd is concerned.

5 *Sūrah al-Ghāfir*: 7

The first narration states:

فَاغْفِرْ لِلَّذِينَ تَابُوا مِنْ وَلَايَةِ فَلَانٍ وَفُلَانٍ وَبَنِي أُمِيَّةٍ

So forgive those who have repented from the Wilāyah of so and so and Banū Umayyah.

(‘So and so’ is with reference to Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا).

The second narration states:

فَاغْفِرْ لِلَّذِينَ تَابُوا مِنْ وَلَايَةِ الطَّوَاعِثِ الثَّلَاثَةِ

So forgive those who have repented from the Wilāyah of the three devils.

(Here, they are referring to Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ).

The third narration states:

فَاغْفِرْ لِلَّذِينَ تَابُوا مِنْ وَلَايَةِ هَؤُلَاءِ وَبَنِي أُمِيَّةٍ وَاتَّبَعُوا سَبِيلَكَ هُوَ أَمِيرُ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ

So forgive those who have repented from the Wilāyah of these and the Banū Umayyah, “and followed Your way,” i.e. Amīr al-Mu’minīn.¹

All of these three narrations are attributed falsely — as usual — to Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad al-Bāqir, whose piety and knowledge belies that they ever be attributed to him. These narrations establish for us a new meaning to the word towbah. At its core, it is nothing more than loving one man and hating another. There is no other dimension to it. Thus, towbah can only be done regarding Wilāyah of the Imām. All else does not demand any repentance or remorse. This is why they did not mention anything besides Wilāyah of the Imām.

It is as if the Shī‘ah, by means of these interpretations, have exonerated the one who believes in the wilāyah of ‘Alī from all sins, even though his crimes are as many

1 Al-Burhān 4/92-93, Tafṣīr al-Ṣāfi 4/335, Tafṣīr al-Qummī 2/255

as the dust particles on the earth. Conversely, acceptance of the khilāfah of the most virtuous ones of all the creation (besides the ambiyā') — Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ — is believed by them to be disbelief, along with which no amount of virtue holds any weight. Is this Islam? Was this (the Wilāyah of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) the only reason why the Rasūl and his Ṣaḥābah struggled and exerted themselves?

Furthermore, what effects do these narrations have on those who believe that they are the words of Muḥammad al-Bāqir? Will the gravity of sins not leave their hearts? Will it not spur them on to commit every crime and prevent them from good deeds and nobility? These are definitely possible outcomes. Rather, they are realities which have already seen the light of day. I came across an important testimony on the subject in *al-Kāfī*, wherein one of the Shī'ah complains to his Imām regarding the poor character of his Shī'ī brethren. He even expresses surprise at the vast difference in character that he noticed between the Shī'ah and the Ahl al-Sunnah.¹ Al-Shawkānī relates to us some important observations

1 The exact wording is as follows:

'Abd Allah ibn Ya'fūr says, "I said to Abū 'Abd Allah:

انى اخالط الناس فيكثر عجبى من اقوام لا يتولونكم ويتولون فلانا و فلانا لهم امانة و صدق و وفاء و اقوام يتولونكم ليس لهم تلك الامانة ولا الوفاء والصدق؟"

My interaction with people leaves me dumbfounded, as I notice that many people who do not accept your Wilāyah and the Wilāyah of your family, instead they accept the Wilāyah of so and so (i.e. Abū Bakr and 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا, which is an obvious reference to the Ahl al-Sunnah) are trustworthy, faithful and truthful. On the other hand, those who accept your Wilāyah (the Shī'ah) do not have in them the same level of trustworthiness, faithfulness and honesty?

Thereupon, Abū 'Abd Allah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ sat up straight and turned to me as if he had been angered. He then said,

لا دين لمن دان الله بولاية امام جائر ليس من الله ولا عتب على من دان بولاية امام عادل من الله

There is no dīn for the one who worships Allah and accepts the Wilāyah of an oppressive Imām who is not from Allah, and there is no criticism against the one who accepts the just Imām appointed by Allah.

regarding this, which he penned down during his interactions with the Shī'ah.¹ This will be discussed under the chapter, “their effect upon the Islamic world”.

The fundamental and core commandments of Islam, such as ṣalāh, zakāh, ḥajj and ṣiyām (fasting), which appear in the Qur'ān are all references to the Imāms. They report from Abū 'Abd Allah (al-ṣādiq):

نحن الصلاة في كتاب الله عز وجل و نحن الزكاة ونحن الصيام و نحن الحج

We are al-ṣalāh, al-zakāh, al-ṣiyām and al-ḥajj in the Book of Allah ﷻ²

In, fact, the entire dīn — according to them — is the Wilāyah of 'Alī رضي الله عنه. Thus, they report from Ja'far al-Ṣādiq regarding the interpretation of the verse:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ اصْطَفَى لَكُمُ الدِّينَ

Indeed Allāh has chosen for you this religion,³

continued from page 231

I asked, “there is no dīn for those people and these people are beyond any criticism?”

He replied:

الا تسمع لقول الله عز وجل: إِنَّ اللَّهَ وَلِيُّ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا يُخْرِجُهُم مِّنَ الظُّلُمَاتِ إِلَى النُّورِ يَعْنِي مِّنَ ظُلُمَاتِ الذُّنُوبِ إِلَى نُورِ التَّوْبَةِ وَالْمَغْفِرَةِ لَوْلَا يَتِيهِمْ كُلُّ إِمَامٍ عَادِلٍ مِنَ اللَّهِ

Do you not hear the speech of Allah, “Allah is the ally of those who believe. He brings them out from darkness’s into the light?” (Sūrah al-Baqarah: 257) This means that He brings them out from the darkness of sins into the light of repentance and forgiveness as a result of them accepting every just Imām from Allah. (Uṣūl al-Kāfi 1/375)

1 He says, “I, as well as others, have seen along the course of our experiences that no Rāfiḍī holds back from any of the prohibitions of the dīn, whatever they may be.” (Talab al-'ilm pg. 73) The remainder of his experiences will appear under the chapter, “their effect upon the Islamic world”.

2 Biḥār al-Anwār 24/303

3 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 132

قال ولاية على رضى الله عنه

He said, “(this is) the Wilāyah of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.”

فَلَا تَمُوتُنَّ إِلَّا وَأَنتُمْ مُسْلِمُونَ

So do not die except while you are Muslims.¹

لولاية على

In the sense that you have accepted the Wilāyah of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.²

Tafsīr al-Qummī states regarding the verse of Allah:

أَنْ أَقِيمُوا الدِّينَ

establish the religion.³

قال الامام ولا تتفرقوا فيه كناية عن امير المؤمنين رضى الله عنه

i.e. the Imām. Do not be divided therein (the next part of the verse) is an indication towards Amīr al-Mu’minīn رضي الله عنه.

كَبُرَ عَلَى الْمُشْرِكِينَ مَا تَدْعُوهُمْ إِلَيْهِ

Difficult for those who associate others with Allah is that to which you invite them.⁴

من امر ولاية على

This is regarding the Wilāyah of ‘Alī

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 132

2 *Al-Burhān* 1/156, *Mir’āt al-Anwār* pg. 148

3 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 13

4 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 13

اللَّهُ يَجْتَبِي إِلَيْهِ مَنْ يَشَاءُ

Allah chooses for Himself whom He wills.¹

كناية عن على عليه السلام

This is an indication towards ‘Alī عليه السلام.

If the matter is as stated by them, why was the dīn not named “Dīn al-Muntaẓar” (the awaited one) or “Dīn al-Wilāyah” or “al-Wilāyah”? The truth of the matter is that this religion is a religion other than Islam. The central doctrine of it is the obedience of a mortal. Apparently, the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah have inherited their religion from the Kaysāniyyah², as they believe — as stated by al-Shahrastānī:

They are grouped together on the basis of one belief; din is the obedience of a mortal. This led them to interpreting the fundamental laws of the shar‘ah such as ṣalāh, ṣiyām, zakāh, ḥajj and other laws to mean men... whoever believes that din is the obedience of a man and he has no man (as he is hidden in his chamber), then he has no dīn.³

1 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 13

2 They are an extremist Shī‘ī sect who believe in the Imāmah of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah. They were named al-Kaysāniyyah as a means of identifying them with Mukhtār ibn Abī ‘Ubayd al-Thaqaṭī, as he was called Kaysān. They are also referred to as al-Mukhtāriyyah by some authors on the subject of sects. Al-Mukhtār claimed that he received revelation and he believed in Badā as well as other deviant beliefs. It is also said that they are called al-Kaysāniyyah with reference to a man called Kaysān, who was the freed slave of part of the Bujaylah tribe of Kūfah. He is also believed to be the freed slave of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. The Kaysāniyyah divided into many sects, a total of twenty one according to al-Ash‘arī. They could be divided into two primary sects according to al-Baghdādī; one sect who believes that Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah did not pass away and he is the awaited Mahdī, and another sect who believes that Imāmah shifted after his demise to others. Thereafter, they differ regarding the one to whom it shifted. Refer to al-Ash‘arī: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/91, al-Baghdādī: *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg. 23, 38, 53, Ibn Ḥazm: *al-Fiṣal* 5/35-36, 40-41, 43, al-Rāzī: *l’itiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn wa l-Mushrikīn* pg. 93-95, Nishwān al-Ḥimyarī: *al-Ḥūr al-‘Ayn* pg. 157, Ibn al-Murtaḍā: *al-Munyat wa l-Amal* pg. 82-83, al-Nāshī al-Akbar: *Masā’il al-Imāmah* pg. 25,26, al-Qummī: *al-Maqālāt wa l-Firaq* pg. 21-22, al-Nawbakhtī: *Firaq al-Shī‘ah* pg. 23-24,27, Widad al-Qāḍī: *al-Kaysāniyyah fi l-Tārīkh wa l-Adab*

3 *Al-Milal wa l-Niḥal* 1/147

Thus, dīn was now confined to the Wilāyah of one man, ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه. Subsequently, the meanings of all of that which indicates towards dīn — like the obedience of Allah and His Rasūl, following the path of goodness and abstaining from evil, etc. — were shifted away from their religious implications according to their narrations.

The word ummah, the meaning of which is well known and it appears forty-nine times in the Book of Allah, is interpreted by the Shī‘ah to mean Imāms or the Shī‘ah. It is stated in *Mir’āt al-Anwār*:

ان الذى يستفاد من رواياتنا على اختلاف الفاظها تاويل الامة فيما يناسب بالائمة عليهم السلام و باهل الحق و الشيعة المحقة و ان قلوا

The crux of our narrations (even though their wordings are different) is that the word ummah will be interpreted to mean the Imāms wherever possible, and the *Ahl al-Ḥaq* (people of the truth) and the sect (Shī‘ah) who are upon the truth, even though they may be few in number.¹

Thereafter, the author quotes some of their narrations to prove this interpretation from many of their reliable books. If the word ummah is accepted to mean Imāms, it would mean that the Qur’ān was revealed specifically for them, and the ummah have neither been addressed in the Qur’ān, nor is it their responsibility to practice upon it.

Inanimate objects are also used to refer to the Imāms. The meaning of the word “well” is not unknown. However, the Shī‘ah have a different opinion. They interpret it, as far as the Qur’ān is concerned, to mean:

بعلى رضى الله عنه و بولايته و بالامام الصامت - يعنون القرآن- و بامام الغائب و بفاطمة و ولدها المعطلين من الملك

‘Alī رضي الله عنه, his Wilāyah, the silent Imām (the Qur’ān), the absent Imām and the progeny of Fāṭimah who were deprived of kingdom.²

1 *Mir’āt al-Anwār* pg. 81

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 36/104-105, *Mir’āt al-Anwār* pg. 94, *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/85, *al-Burhān* 3/96-97, *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/427, *Ma’ānī al-Akhhbār* pg. 111

This interpretation is applied to the verse:

فَكَأَيُّ مِّنْ قَرْيَةٍ أَهْلَكْنَاهَا وَهِيَ ظَالِمَةٌ فَهِيَ خَاوِيَةٌ عَلَى عُرُوشِهَا وَبِئْرٌ مُّعَطَّلَةٌ وَقَصْرٌ مَّشِيدٌ

And how many a city did We destroy while it was committing wrong – so it is [now] fallen into ruin – and [how many] an abandoned well and [how many] a lofty palace.¹

Five narrations appear in *al-Burhān* confirming this interpretation.²

The word sea appears more than thirty three times in the Book of Allah, in contexts which make it obvious that the literal meaning is intended. Despite this, the Shī'ah prefer to interpret it to mean the Imām, Imāms and their enemies. The author of *Mir'āt al-Anwār* quotes many of the narrations of his brethren regarding this interpretation. Thereafter he says:

و لا يخفى ان المستفاد من ذلك جواز تاويل البحر والبحار العذبة.. المشتملة على المدح و النفع بالامام و الائمة بل بفاطمة.. و تاويل البحر و البحار المالحة باعدائهم

It is obvious that, from that, the permissibility of interpreting sea and sweet seas (rivers)... which contain praise and benefit to mean the Imām, Imāms and even Fāṭimah is established. Salty sea and seas can be interpreted to mean their enemies.³

Tafsīr al-Qummī and others report from Abū 'Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) regarding the verse:

مَرَجَ الْبَحْرَيْنِ يَلْتَقِيْنِ

He released the two seas, meeting [side by side]⁴

1 Sūrah al-Ḥajj: 45

2 *al-Burhān* 3/96-97

3 *Mir'āt al-Anwār* pg. 94

4 Sūrah al-Raḥmān: 19

قال مَرَجَ الْبَحْرَيْنِ يَلْتَمِئَانِ عَلَى وَ فاطمة بحران عميقان لا يبغي احدهما على صاحبه

He released the two seas, meeting [side by side] — ‘Alī and Fāṭimah; they are two deep seas, but neither of them oppresses the other.

بَيْنَهُمَا بَرْزَخٌ لَا يَبْغِيَانِ

From both of them emerge pearl and coral.

الحسن والحسين

Ḥasan and Ḥusayn.¹

Interpreting abstract meanings and “the greatest example” to mean Imāmāh and the Imāms. “Good” is taken to mean Wilāyah. Al-Kāẓim says — as claimed by them — regarding the verse:

وَأَفْعُلُوا الْخَيْرَ لَعَلَّكُمْ تُفْلِحُونَ

and do good²

قال الولاية

He said, “(it is) al-Wilāyah.”³

Regarding the verse:

فَاسْتَبِقُوا الْخَيْرَاتِ

So race to [all that is] good.⁴

1 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/344, *Tafsīr Furāt* pg. 177, Ibn Bābawayh: *al-Khiṣāl* pg. 65, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī* 5/109, *al-Burhān* (twelve narrations are quoted regarding this interpretation) 4/265, *Biḥār al-Anwār* (an entire chapter was dedicated to this titled, “they are the sea, pearls and corals” 24/97. Refer to the comments of Ibn Taymiyyah regarding these interpretations quoted previously.

2 *Sūrah al-Ḥajj*: 77

3 *Mir’āt al-Anwār* pg. 139

4 *Sūrah al-Baqarah*: 148

Abū Ja‘far (al-Bāqir) said:

الخيرات الولاية

[all that is] good refers to Wilāyah.¹

Verses regarding the universe are also a reference to the Imāms. They are referred to as landmarks in the verse:

وَعَلَّمَتْهُمُ الْبِلَاقِطِ وَالنَّجْمِ هُمْ يَهْتَدُونَ

And landmarks. And by the stars they are [also] guided.²

Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) said – as reported by them:

النجم رسول الله و العلامات هم الائمة عليهم السلام

“The stars,” refers to the Rasūl ﷺ, and “landmarks,” refers to the A‘immah.³

Al-Kulaynī has a chapter regarding this titled, “the Imāms are the landmarks mentioned by Allah in His Book.”⁴ Al-Majlisī followed in his footsteps and named a chapter, “they are the stars and the landmarks.”⁵ The context in which the verse appears as well as that which is reported from the pious predecessors demands that this interpretation of the verse should be rejected.⁶

1 *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/200, *al-Burhān* 1/163

2 *Sūrah al-Naḥl*: 16

3 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/383, *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/255, *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/206, *al-Burhān* 2/362, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 3/129, *Tafsīr Furāt* pg. 84, *Majma‘ al-Bayān* 4/62

4 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/206

5 *Bihār al-Anwār* 24/67-82

6 Refer to *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 14/92, *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 2/612

The conditions and stages of the Day of Judgement are interpreted by them to mean the reincarnation of the Imāms or Wilāyah. Thus, *al-Ṣā‘ah* (the hour), *al-Qiyāmah*, *al-Nushūr* (the resurrection) and other names related to the Day of Judgement are interpreted by them, in most cases, to mean the reincarnation of the Imāms. The author of *Mir‘āt al-Anwār* mentions it as a rule:

كل ما عبر به بيوم القيامة في ظاهر التنزيل فتاويله بالرجعة

Wherever the Day of Qiyāmah appears in the apparent wording of the Qur’ān, it refers to reincarnation.¹

Al-Majlisī says regarding the word *sā‘ah* (hour) which appears in the Qur’ān:

ان الساعة ظهرها القيامة و بطنها الرجعة

The outward meaning of *al-sā‘ah* is Qiyāmah and the inner meaning is reincarnation.²

The interpretation of the word *al-sā‘ah* to mean Wilāyah has also been reported by them. They report from al-Riḍā regarding the verse:

بَلْ كَذَّبُوا بِالسَّاعَةِ

But they have denied the Hour.³

قال يعنى كذبوا بولاية على

This means that they denied the Wilāyah of ‘Alī.⁴

1 *Mir‘āt al-Anwār* pg. 303

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/334

3 Sūrah al-Furqān: 11

4 Al-Nu‘mānī: *al-Ghaybah* pg. 54, *al-Burhān* 3/157, *Mir‘āt al-Anwār* pg. 182

The worldly life refers to the reincarnation, according to them. The author of *Mir'āt al-Anwār* says:

جاء ما يدل على تاويل الدنيا بالرجعة و بولاية ابى بكر و عمر

That which indicates that “the world” should be interpreted to mean reincarnation and the Wilāyah of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar has been reported.¹

Imām Ja‘far said regarding the verse:

إِنَّا لَنَنْصُرُ رُسُلَنَا وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا فِي الْحَيَاةِ الدُّنْيَا وَيَوْمَ يَقُومُ الْأَشْهَادُ

Indeed, We will support Our Messengers and those who believe during the life of this world.²

يعنى الرجعة

This refers to reincarnation.³

Regarding the verse:

بَلْ تُؤْثِرُونَ الْحَيَاةَ الدُّنْيَا

But you prefer the worldly life.⁴

قال ولايتهم

He said, “it is their (Abū Bakr and ‘Umar عليه السلام) Wilāyah.”⁵

1 *Mir'āt al-Anwār* pg. 150

2 *Sūrah al-Ghāfir*: 51

3 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/258-259, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 4/345, *al-Burhān* 4/100

4 *Sūrah al-A'lā*: 16

5 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/418, *al-Burhān* 4/451

At this point, we wish to remind you that ‘inner interpretations’ are not governed by any laws. You have just seen that “the hereafter” was interpreted to mean reincarnation, just as the worldly life was interpreted to mean the same. This is despite the vast difference between the two. Similarly, the worldly life is interpreted on one occasion to mean reincarnation and on another occasion to mean Wilāyah whereas there is absolutely no link between the two. They are senseless and random statements which have no basis, even as far as logic is concerned.

Their interpretation of verses to mean Imām and Imāms are so many that they are difficult to count. It is as if the Qur’ān was not revealed except regarding them. They have exceeded all the limits set by the intellect in trying to establish this claim. They have imitated, in their interpretations, the jokes of mentally-challenged persons, to the extent that they claim that the bee mentioned in the following verse is a reference to the Imāms:

وَأَوْحَىٰ رَبُّكَ إِلَى النَّحْلِ

And your Rabb inspired to the bee.¹

Al-Qummī reports with his isnād from Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq):

نحن التي اوحى الله اليها ان اتخذني من الجبال مبيتا امرنا ان نتخذ من العرب شيعة ومن الشجر يقول من العجم ومما يعرشون يقول من الموالي

We are the ones to whom Allah revealed, “take for yourself among the mountains, houses,” he commanded us to take Shī‘ah from the Arabs, “and among the trees,” the non-Arabs, “and [in] that which they construct.” the freed slaves.²

Al-Majlisī gathered their narrations regarding this subject in a chapter named, “a rare chapter regarding interpreting the bee to mean them (Imāms).”³ Similarly,

1 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 68

2 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/387

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/110-113

he mentions many narrations in which it is stated that the Imāms are sweet water, a lofty palace, clouds, rain, fruit and all other outwardly beneficial objects.¹ Under the chapter in which he titled, “interpreting days and months to mean A’immah,”² the following appears:

نحن الايام فالسبت اسم رسول الله والاحد كناية عن امير المؤمنين والاثنين الحسن والحسين والثلاثاء على بن الحسين ومحمد بن علي وجعفر بن محمد والاربعاء موسى بن جعفر وعلي بن موسى ومحمد بن علي وانا والخميس ابني الحسن بن علي والجمعة ابن ابني

We are the days of the week. Saturday is the name of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, Sunday is a reference to Amīr al-Mu’minīn, Monday is Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, Tuesday is ‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn, Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī, and Ja’far ibn Muḥammad, Wednesday is Mūsā ibn Ja’far, ‘Alī ibn Mūsā, Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī and me, Thursday is my son Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī and Friday is my grandson.³

A point of humour at this juncture is that some days are singled out in Shī‘ī narrations to be loathsome.⁴ Would this also be directed at the Imām to whom it refers to? The answer cannot be in the negative as “the Imāms are the days!” Jābir al-Ju‘fī reports, “I asked Abū Ja’far (al-Bāqir) regarding the verse of Allah:

إِنَّ عِدَّةَ الشُّهُورِ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ اثْنَا عَشَرَ شَهْرًا فِي كِتَابِ اللَّهِ قَالَ فَتَنْفَسَ سَيِّدِي الصَّعْدَاءُ ثُمَّ قَالَ يَا جَابِرُ أَمَا السَّنَةُ فِيهِ جَدِي رَسُولُ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ وَشَهْرُهَا اثْنَا عَشَرَ شَهْرًا فَهُوَ أَمِيرُ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ إِلَى وَالِ ابْنِي جَعْفَرُ وَابْنُهُ مُوسَى وَابْنُهُ عَلِيٌّ وَابْنُهُ مُحَمَّدٌ وَابْنُهُ عَلِيٌّ وَالِ ابْنُهُ الْحَسَنُ وَالِ ابْنُهُ مُحَمَّدُ الْهَادِي الْمَهْدِي اثْنَا عَشَرَ أَمَامًا... وَالْأَرْبَعَةُ الْحَرَمُ الَّذِينَ هُمْ الدِّينُ الْقِيمُ أَرْبَعَةٌ مِنْهُمْ يَخْرُجُونَ بِاسْمِ وَاحِدٍ عَلَى أَمِيرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ وَابْنِي عَلِيٌّ بْنُ الْحُسَيْنِ وَعَلِيٌّ بْنُ مُوسَى وَعَلِيٌّ بْنُ مُحَمَّدٍ فَالْأَقْرَارُ بِهَؤُلَاءِ هُوَ الدِّينُ الْقِيمُ فَلَا تَظْلِمُوا فِيهِمْ أَنْفُسَكُمْ أَيُّ قَوْلُوا بِهِمْ تَهْتَدُوا

“Indeed, the number of months with Allah is twelve [lunar] months in the register of Allah.”⁵ My master took a deep sigh and then said, “O Jābir, the

1 Ibid 24/100-110

2 Ibid 24/238-243

3 *Al-Biḥār* 24/239, al-Ṣadūq: *al-Khiṣāl* pg. 395-396. The statement is attributed to their tenth Imām ‘Alī al-Hādī.

4 Refer to *Safīnat Al-Biḥār* 1/137

5 Sūrah al-Towbah: 36

year is my grandfather, the Rasūl ﷺ, its months are Amīr al-Mu'minīn until me¹ and my son Ja'far, his son Mūsā, his son 'Alī, his son Muḥammad, his son 'Alī, his son Ḥasan, his son Muḥammad al-Hādī al-Mahdī — twelve Imams. The four sacred ones who are the correct religion are four from them who have the same name; 'Alī Amīr al-Mu'minīn, my father 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn, 'Alī ibn Mūsā and 'Alī ibn Muḥammad. Accepting them is the correct religion. 'So do not wrong yourselves during them,' means that if you believe in them, you will be guided."²

The mosquito (a small and well-known insect) which was mentioned in Sūrah al-Baqarah³ is 'Alī ﷺ according to them.⁴ The word fly is also interpreted in Shī'ī books to mean 'Alī ﷺ. One of them tried to water down this interpretation by claiming that this refers to the honey-bee (which is called the honey-fly in Arabic). However, he did not realise that this interpretation was applied to the verse:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ تَدْعُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ لَنْ يَخْلُقُوا ذُبَابًا وَلَوْ اجْتَمَعُوا لَهُ

Indeed, those you invoke besides Allah will never create [as much as] a fly, even if they gathered together for it [i.e., that purpose].⁵

The question that troubles us is, what is the secret behind using the names of the most despicable insects to refer to Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī ﷺ, especially since this is done by a sect who claims to be his ardent lovers? The truth is, the hatred has slipped of their tongues, and that which is concealed in their hearts is even worse. Their practical track-record as far as the Ahl al-Bayt is concerned is of a much more severe and abysmal nature.

1 i.e. Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and the Imāms after him until it reaches me. Al-Majlisī: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/240

2 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* pg. 96, Ibn Shahrāshūb: *Manāqib Āl Abī Ṭālib* 1/244, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/240, *al-Burhān* 2/122-123, *Nūr al-Thaqalayn* 2/214-215, *al-Lawāmi' al-Nūrāniyyah* pg. 141

3 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 26

4 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/35, *al-Burhān* 1/70

5 Sūrah al-Ḥajj: 73

The graves of the Imāms received a fair share of their interpretations. The blessed piece of land in the following verse is Karbalā'.¹

فَلَمَّا أَتَاهَا نُودِيَ مِنْ شَاطِئِ الْوَادِ الْأَيْمَنِ فِي الْبُقْعَةِ الْمُبْرَكَةِ مِنَ الشَّجَرَةِ

But when he came to it, he was called from the right side of the valley in a blessed spot — from the tree.²

It is well-known that this land was none other than Mount Sinai, as proven from the verse immediately before this verse:

مِنْ جَانِبِ الطُّورِ

from the direction of the mount.³

Just as the Imāms of the Shī'ah have been referred to in these verses as claimed by their narrations, similarly, the followers have also been singled out in verses of the Book of Allah, to the extent that the Shī'ah are “the things” in the verse:

وَرَحْمَتِي وَسِعَتْ كُلَّ شَيْءٍ

My mercy encompasses all things.⁴

Thus, they wish to confine the all-encompassing mercy of Allah to the Shī'ah, and place limits upon that which Allah had granted in abundance to His servants. Similarly, they wish to interpret the words *shirk*, *kufr*, *riddah* (turning renegade) and *ḍalāl* (misguidance) against the meanings that is known to the Muslims. All of these words are interpreted to mean the failure to pledge allegiance to the twelve

1 Ibn Qūluwayh: *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* pg. 48-49, *al-Burhān* 3/336, *Mir'āt al-Anwār* pg. 192

2 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 30

3 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 29

4 Sūrah al-A'rāf: 156

Imāms (even though the only one amongst them who held the post of khilāfah was Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī (رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ)).

There are tens of narrations of this nature. We have previously pointed out that their scholar, al-Majlisī dedicated a few chapters in his *Biḥār*, the titles of which are all in conformity to this 'inner' interpretation. Some of these chapters comprise of a hundred narrations. Here, we are only presenting examples of these aḥādīth. Among them is the following interpretation which appears in Shī'ī books:

لَئِنْ أَشْرَكَتَ لَيَجْبَطَنَّ عَمَلُكَ وَلَتَكُونَنَّ مِنَ الْخُسِرِينَ

If you should associate [anything] with Allah, your work would surely become worthless.¹

لئن اشركت في امامة على ولاية غيره

If you accept anyone else's Wilāyah with the Imāmah of 'Alī.²

The author of *Mir'āt al-Anwār* says:

فعلى هذا جميع المخالفين مشركون

Based upon this, all those who oppose (the Shī'ah) are mushrikīn.³

He adds:

ان الاخبار متضافرة في تاويل الشرك بالله والشرك بعبادته بالشرك في الولاية و الامامة

There are a great number of (Shī'ī) narrations in which it is mentioned that shirk with regards to Allah and the worshipping of Allah should be interpreted to mean shirk in Wilāyah and Imāmah.⁴

1 Sūrah al-Zumar: 65

2 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/251, *Tafsīr Furāt* pg. 132, *al-Burhān* 4/83, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 4/328

3 Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sharīf: *Mir'āt al-Anwar* pg. 202

4 *ibid*

This is precisely the reason due to which they declared the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ to be renegades, as they pledged allegiance to Abū Bakr instead of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.¹ Kufr is also interpreted in this way by them. *Al-Kāfī* reports from Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-ṣādiq) regarding the statement of Allah the most honoured and glorified:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا ثُمَّ كَفَرُوا ثُمَّ آمَنُوا ثُمَّ كَفَرُوا ثُمَّ أَزْدَادُوا كُفْرًا لَنْ تُقْبَلَ تَوْبَتُهُمْ ؕ

Indeed, those who have believed then disbelieved, then believed then disbelieved, and then increased in disbelief — never will their [claimed] repentance be accepted.²

قال نزلت في فلان و فلان و فلان آمنوا بالنبي صلى الله عليه و سلم في اول الامر و كفروا حيث عرضت عليهم الولاية... ثم آمنوا بالبيعة لأمير المؤمنين عليه السلام ثم كفروا حيث مضى رسول الله صلى الله عليه و اله فلم يقرؤا بالبيعة ثم ازدادوا كفرا باخذهم من بايعه بالبيعة لهم فهو لاء لم يبق فيهم من الايمان شيئ

This verse was revealed regarding *fulān* (an Arabic word used to refer to an unnamed person), *fulān* and *fulān*.³ They believed in Nabī ﷺ in the beginning and then disbelieved when Wilāyah was presented to them... Thereafter they believed in the bay‘ah (pledge of allegiance) of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn عليه السلام and thereafter disbelieved when Rasūlullāh ﷺ passed on, as they did not uphold the bay‘ah. Then, they increased in kufr by taking as their supporters those who pledged allegiance to him. Consequently, no bit of īmān remained in them.⁴

1 More details regarding this will appear under the chapter of Imāmāh.

2 Take note that two verses from two different Sūrahs have been joint and presented as if they are one verse. This clearly indicates that the one who fabricated these tales in the name of the Ahl al-Bayt was an ignorant and irreligious character. The last portion of the verse, “never will their [claimed] repentance be accepted,” is from Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān (90), whereas the first portion, “indeed, those who have believed then disbelieved, then believed then disbelieved, and then increased in disbelief,” is from Sūrah al-Nisā (137).

3 This refers to Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنهم, as explained by one of their scholars. This will appear in more detail under the chapter of Imāmāh.

4 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/420, *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/159, *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 1/276, *al-Burhān* 1/421, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī* 1/511, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 23/375, *Mir‘āt al-Anwār* pg. 289

Thus, as you have just seen, they have confined this judgement to the best of the creation after the *ambiyā'*. What then is their belief regarding the rest of the *ummah* of Muḥammad ﷺ? One of their scholars indicated towards the reason behind specifying them as the ones regarding whom the verse was revealed. He says:

ورد في بعض الروايات تاويل الكفر برؤساء المخالفين لا سيما الثلاثة (يعنون الخلفاء الراشدين) مبالغة
بزيادة كفرهم و جحدهم

It appears in some narrations that the interpretation of *kufr* is a reference to the leaders of the opposition, especially the three (i.e. the rightly guided *khulafā'*). This is to emphasise the point due to their extreme *kufr* and denial.¹

The word *riddah* means turning renegade as far as the *bay'ah* of the twelve Imāms. It appears in *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* as well as others from Abū 'Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) regarding the verse of Allah:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ ارْتَدُّوا عَلَىٰ أَدْبَارِهِمْ مِّنْ بَعْدِ مَا تَبَيَّنَ لَهُمُ الْهُدَىٰ

Indeed, those who reverted back [to disbelief] after guidance had become clear to them.²

قال فلان و فلان و فلان ارتدوا من الايمان فى ترك ولاية امير المؤمنين

Fulān, fulān and fulān turned renegade from *īmān* as they abandoned the *Wilāyah* of Amīr al-Mu'minīn.³

Ḍalāl (deviation), according to them means failing to recognise the Imām. It is said regarding the verse of Allah:

1 *Mir'āt al-Anwār* pg. 187

2 *Sūrah Muḥammad*: 25

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/420, *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/159, *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī* 1/276, *al-Burhān* 1/421, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī* 1/511, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 23/375, *Mir'āt al-Anwār* pg. 289

لَمْ تَرَ إِلَى الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا نَصِيبًا مِّنَ الْكِتَابِ يَشْتُرُونَ الضَّلَالَةَ

Have you not seen those who were given a portion of the Scripture, purchasing misguidance [in exchange for it]¹

قال يعنى ضلوا فى امير المؤمنين

i.e. they were misguided regarding Amīr al-Mu'minīn.²

They say regarding the verse:

غَيْرِ الْمَغْضُوبِ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا الضَّالِّينَ

not of those who have evoked [Your] anger or of those who are astray.³

قال الضالين: الذين لا يعرفون الامام

“Those who are astray,” are those who do not recognise the Imām.⁴

The interpretation of kufr, shirk, riddah and ḍalāl to mean abandoning the pledge of allegiance to the twelve Imāms — besides it not being backed by divine texts, intellect, language or sharī'ah — leads a Muslim to granting superiority to kufr and kuffār over all Muslims (besides the Shī'ah — who claim to be Muslim — as the core of Kufr is the rejection of Imāmah). Perhaps this was the actual goal of the one who fabricated this narration. The result of this was seen along the course of Sunnī-Shī'ī history.

Another glaring distortion that comes to the fore due to these interpretations is that the crimes of shirk and irreligiousness are taken to be extremely light offences, if they are even taken to be offences at all. If this is not the demolition

1 Sūrah al-Nisā: 44

2 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/139

3 Sūrah al-Fātiḥah: 7

4 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/29

of the foundations of Islam and a calculated war against the nubuwah of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allah ﷺ — who was sent to combat and annihilate shirk, kufr and ḍalāl thereby establishing the laws of towḥīd and the sharī‘ah of Islam — then what else is it?

Major sins and all other prohibitions, according to them, is nothing more than a reference to the enemies of the Imāms. They claim that Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) said:

...وعدونا في كتاب الله عز وجل: الفحشاء والمنكر والبغى والخمر والميسر والانصاب والازلام و
الاصنام والاثاث والجبت والطاغوت والميتة والدم ولحم الخنزير

Our enemies are in the Book of Allah, the most honoured and glorified, immorality, evilness, oppression, wine, gambling, sacrificing on stone alters, taking omens from arrows, idols, false deities, the devil, carrion, blood and the flesh of pigs.¹

We have already indicated that the interpretation of the prohibitions to mean the enemies of the Imāms appears in many chapters of *Al-Biḥār*, many of which comprise of tens of narrations. Some of their reliable books have revealed the name of the one who fabricated all this bunkum. They explain that the interpretation of prohibitions to mean the enemies of the Imām, and interpreting the commandments to mean the Imāms was started by Abū al-Khaṭṭāb, the one from whom the Imāms dissociated themselves and cursed them. *Rijāl al-Kashshī* has it:

كتب ابو عبد الله الى ابي الخطاب بلغني انك تزعم ان الزنا رجل و ان الخمر رجل و ان الصلاة رجل و ان
الصيام رجل و ان الفواحش رجل و ليس هو كما تقول

Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) wrote to Abū al-Khaṭṭāb, “it has reached me that you claim that zinā is a man, wine is a man, ṣalāh is a man, ṣiyām is a man, immorality is a man. The matter is not as you say.”²

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/203

2 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 291, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/299

The books regarding sects mention that some extremist Shī'ah would believe that the prohibitions are all names of people who Allah commanded us to have enmity for, and the commandments are names of people who we have been commanded to befriend.¹ Al-Shahrastānī says:

The object behind interpreting the commandments and prohibitions to mean certain men is that whoever has the fortune of knowing this man will be relieved of all responsibilities and none of the above will be directed to him.²

The Ithnā 'Ashariyyah inherited all of this drivel and they have revived it. Al-Qummī (the author of the *Tafsīr*), al-Kulaynī, al-'Ayyāshī, al-Kāshānī, al-Majlisī and other scholars of the Safawid dynasty had an enormous share in reviving this as well as all the other tales of the extremist Shī'ī sects. They included them in the beliefs of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah as if they were authentic narrations from the Imāms.

Nevertheless, their interpretations in this chapter are enough to fill up volumes. Each doctrine regarding which they have differed and opposed the rest of the ummah — reincarnation, occultation, dissimulation, etc. — have interpretations and fabrications which cannot be counted. We will delve into this under the discussions regarding them, Allah willing. Whatever has been mentioned thus far is only a portion of that which we have collected. However, we did not mention them fearing that the discussion will lengthen greatly. The quotations mentioned are but a drop from the ocean. Presenting all of them and then analysing them would require volumes of books. Most of these narrations reveal to us one of their beliefs regarding their deity, nubuwwah, the names and attributes of Allah, the foundations of Islam, etc.

Finally, before concluding the discussion on this subject, I would like to pen down the following observations:

1 *Al-Milal wa l-Niḥal* 1/179

2 *ibid*

1. We have thus far mentioned the belief of the Shī'ah that most of the Qur'ān was revealed regarding them and their enemies. Thereafter, examples of their distortion of the meanings of the Qur'ān were presented. All of these examples emphasise the belief of the Shī'ah that most of the Qur'ān is regarding the twelve Imāms and their 'enemies'. The scholars of the Shī'ah have gathered thousands of texts, as indicated previously, to establish this. However, after all of this, we find that these claims are contradicted by their own texts.

This text, from Abū 'Abd Allah Ja'far al-Ṣādiq states:

لو قرئ القرآن كما انزل لالفتنا فيها مسمين

If the Qur'ān was recited as it was revealed, you would have found us named (in it).¹

This is a clear testimony from them that there is no mention of their Imāms in the Qur'ān, and their names have not appeared therein. It is as if they themselves demolished their own house. Perhaps the secret behind this is that the one who fabricated this narration did so to strengthen the view that the Qur'ān was tempered with, without realising that narrations which contradict this one had already been fabricated. These kinds of contradictions and inconsistencies are a manifestation of the punishment of Allah upon those who attempt to distort His dīn. This can be deduced from His statement:

وَلَوْ كَانَ مِنْ عِنْدِ غَيْرِ اللَّهِ لَوَجَدُوا فِيهِ اخْتِلَافًا كَثِيرًا

If it had been from [any] other than Allah, they would have found within it much contradiction.²

1 *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī* 1/13, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/55, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/41, *al-Lawāmi' al-Nūrāniyyah* pg. 547

2 *Sūrah al-Nisā*: 82

Thus, these contradictions are the greatest proofs that they are not from Allah. Another text of theirs, which was quoted earlier, explains that the Qur'ān is divided into four subjects, none of which included the Imāms. *Rijāl al-Kashshī* contains yet another text which razed to the ground all that they had built up regarding their 'inner' interpretations. Abū 'Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) was informed of the 'inner' interpretations of the sacrilegious ones, whereupon he refuted it. The exact text is:

قيل له روى عنكم ان الخمر و الميسر و الانصاب و الازلام رجال؟ فقال ما كان الله عز و جل ليخاطب خلقه بما لا يعلمون

He was told, "it is narrated from you people that wine, gambling, sacrificing on stone alters are all references to men." He responded, "Allah ﷻ will not address His creation in a manner which they do not know."¹

This means that Allah ﷻ will not address his servants in manner which is impossible for them to understand and comprehend, as this defeats the purpose of revealing the Qur'ān as a guidance for mankind and a call to the worship of Allah. It is unthinkable regarding Allah ﷻ that He commands His servants to ponder and reflect upon the Qur'ān if it is incomprehensible and reflecting upon it will not lead one to its intended meaning. Allah is beyond riddles and puzzles. Anyway, this statement of Abū 'Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq), which is preserved in one their most authentic books on narrators totally annuls all their fantasies and blasphemous interpretations regarding the Book of Allah.

This was an analyses of the matter from their very own sources, which we can refer to as an internal analyses. Nonetheless, anyone who reflects upon the Qur'ān in light of the Arabic language, in which the Qur'ān was revealed, will not find any of their claims to be close to the truth. Allah says:

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 291

إِنَّا أَنْزَلْنَاهُ قُرْآنًا عَرَبِيًّا لَعَلَّكُمْ تَعْقِلُونَ

Indeed, We have sent it down as an Arabic Quran that you might understand.¹

The narrations quoted by them have been adequately debunked, as merely reproducing them explains their lack of substance. Will anyone believe that ‘Alī عليه السلام has 1154 names in the Qur’ān? Who is able to digest that “the fly” and “the mosquito” are references to ‘Alī عليه السلام? Is there any believer who will accept that the verses relating to the Day of Qiyāmah in the Qur’ān are all, in fact regarding the doctrine of reincarnation? Is it worth debating the one who believes that the verses regarding īmān and mu’minīn are in fact regarding the twelve Imāms and the verses of kufr and kāfirīn are regarding the noble Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم?

At this juncture, I would like to voice my opinion regarding these people stooping to such lowly extremes. I believe that this is from the miracles of this fortified dīn. None has ever claimed nubuwwah or intended to add to this dīn that which is not from it, except that Allah disgraced him publicly. By the oath of Allah, these views cannot ever be in harmony with the intellect, divine texts, the rules of language or dīn. This is the biggest exposure and the greatest form of disgrace that has been inflicted upon this nation. In this way, Allah exposed their lies and accusations.

Indeed the printing presses of Najaf, Tehran, Qum and Bombay have brought out to us the Shī‘ī heritage, which reveals the entire religion, the most accurate name of which could either be the dīn of Wilāyah or the dīn of Imāmah. (It has nothing to do with Islam). These books were not available to the Muslims of the past to the degree that they are available today. It is the dīn which was invented by al-Majlisī, al-Kulaynī and the other masterminds of the Shī‘ah. By means of these books, many realities which were previously hidden away have come to the fore. Another

1 Sūrah Yūsuf: 2

advantage that is realised by means of these books is that the grandeur of Islam is highlighted and one also realises the divine protection to keep it in its pristine purity until the end. Many a times the reality of something is only understood when the opposite is witnessed or experienced. If it was not for bitterness, none would appreciate sweetness.

Perhaps the revival of the Shī'ī legacy and heritage signals the end of their lifespan, as they have always survived by hiding their beliefs and practising Taqiyyah. However, today their reliable books have exposed them in a befitting manner, allowing one and all to see what their beliefs are and thereafter expose their deviance.

2. These 'inner' interpretations with which the books of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah are replete, are unknown to many who write regarding this sect. Suffice to say, you will find some who write regarding them who believe that they (the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah) have nothing to do with *Bāṭinīsm* (secretive and inner meanings which contradict the apparent meanings) and this trait is confined to the Ismā'īliyyah. One of them states:

The Ismā'īliyyah have attributed certain qualities to the Imāms which were unknown to even the other Shī'ī sects. Outwardly, they accept that the Imāms were humans like the rest of mankind, who would eat, sleep and pass away. However, in their inner interpretations, they claim that the Imām is the "face of Allah", "hand of Allah" and the "side of Allah".¹

It should be noted that these (the above- mentioned) interpretations are exactly that which the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah believe in. many narrations of theirs confirm this extremism. Al-Majlisī even dedicated a chapter of his *Biḥār* to this (which he named, "they are the side of Allah, His face, His hand, etc.²), as explained. The reason behind this is, the widespread

1 Muṣṭafā al-Shak'ah: *Islām bi lā Madhā-hib* pg. 247-248

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/191-203

ignorance among a group of authors regarding the types of books written by the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. Their books are of two types; those books which are used to gain followers and support and their authentic and reliable books.

The methodology adopted in the first type is that of deception and Taqiyyah. The second type includes books such as their eight canonical books, their four books on narrators and all those books which are of the same standard as these (according to them), from the books of their scholars. Thus, whoever relies upon the first type alone, will remain ignorant concerning many of their matters. These books, at times, have subtle indications towards their beliefs. However these indications can only be understood by their scholars, or one who has a thorough understanding of their reliable books.

3. One should understand that these interpretations are not considered by them to be debatable opinions regarding the Qur’ān which may or may not be accepted. Rather, they are taken to be divine texts which hold the same position as the revealed texts and the sayings of Nabī ﷺ. Many of their texts sound severe warnings about rejecting these interpretations, which are not supported by the intellect, nature, logic or the language. It is compulsory to simply accept and not have any reservations, as stated in the Arabic proverb, switch off the light in your brain, and believe! They have tried to get their followers accustomed to accepting these types of texts by saying:

ان حديثنا تشمئز منه القلوب فمن عرف فزيدهم و من انكر فذروههم

Indeed the hearts have an aversion from our aḥādīth. Therefore, whoever understands them, increase them and whoever finds fault with them, then leave them.¹

1 Ibid 2

Sufyān al-Simṭ reports that he said to Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-ṣādiq):

May I be sacrificed for you. A man who is infamous for being a liar comes to us from you and he relates a ḥadīth which we find repugnant.

Abū ‘Abd Allah replied:

يقول لك انى قلت لليل انه نهار او للنهار انه ليل قال فان قال لك هذا انى قلته فلا تكذب به فانك انما تكذبني

Does he tell you that I said that the night is the day and the day is the night?
If this is what he told you then do not reject it as you are only belying me
(by rejecting it).¹

There are many narrations such as these ones. A point that is worthy of note is that in the last narration they have admitted that the Shī‘ah find these narrations to be repugnant, however, they are forced to blindly accept them. in fact the judgement regarding the one who has any reservations regarding any of these narrations is:

قال كيف جاء هذا وكيف كان وكيف هو فان هذا والله الشرك بالله العظيم

He says, how did this come (in the narrations), how did it happen, how is it, then by the oath of Allah this is shirk with Allah, the Great.²

The author of *Al-Biḥār* paid special attention to this matter. He quoted 116 of their aḥādīth under a chapter which he titled, “their aḥādīth are extremely difficult, their speech can be interpreted in many different ways, the virtue of pondering upon their narrations submitting to them and the prohibition of rejecting them.”³ The first person to strengthen the

1 Ibid 2/211-212, al-Baḥrānī: *al-Lawāmi‘ al-Nūrāniyyah* pg. 549-550

2 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 194

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 2/182

foundations of this belief was probably the author of *al-Kāfī*, who dedicated a special chapter to it named, “what has been reported that their aḥādīth are extremely difficult.” Under this chapter, he mentions five narrations.¹

This methodology was probably the strongest reason behind these tales being so widespread without being countered by any intelligence which would raise the voice of the truth and expose and disgrace (the champions of) falsehood. It is a type of slavery wherein the followers are expected to accept the saying of the Imām despite their outright opposition of all logic. It is similar to the stance of the extremist and bogus sūfīs who blindly follow all that comes from the Shaykh without being allowed to give it second thought. This is the very same trick that Fir‘own used against his people. Allah indicates towards it saying:

فَاسْتَخَفَّ قَوْمَهُ فَاطَاعُوهُ

So he bluffed his people, and they obeyed him.^{2,3}

4. Tafsīr is of many types according to them, and all are valid. Abū ‘Abd Allah says – as they allege - :

ان قوما امنوا بالظاهر و كفروا بالباطن فلم ينفعهم شئ و جاء قوم من بعدهم فامتنوا بالباطن و كفروا بالظاهر فلم ينفعهم ذلك شيئا و لا ايمان بظاهر الا بباطن و لا باطن الا بظاهر

Some people believed in the outer (meaning) and rejected the inner so that did not benefit them in any way. Another group of people came after them who believed in the inner and rejected the outer. That did not benefit them in any way. There is no īmān upon the outer except if it is coupled with īmān upon the inner and vice-versa.

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/401-402

2 *Sūrah al-Zukhruf*: 54

3 Refer to *al-Madkhal ilā al-Thaqāfat al-Islāmiyyah* pg. 113-115

This is the reason why some Shīʿī books of tafsīr do not mention both interpretations. At times they only mention that which is accommodated by the usage of the language or that which is transmitted from the pious predecessors. However, this does not mean that they do not accept the ‘inner’ interpretation, as they believe that each verse has an inner as well as an outer (meaning) and both are meant (by Allah). Therefore, some of them suffice upon the outer whilst others suffice upon the inner and a third group mentions both.

The exact same methodology is visible in their narrations as we learn from this from the following narration quoted by the author of *al-Kāfī* regarding the interpretation of the verse:

ثُمَّ لِيَقْضُوا تَفَثَهُمْ وَلِيُوفُوا نَذْرَهُمْ

Then let them end their untidiness and fulfil their vows.¹

‘Abd Allah ibn Sinān reports from Dharīḥ al-Muḥāribī who said, “I said to Abū ‘Abd Allah, ‘Allah has commanded me in His book regarding a certain matter and I wish to comply.’ He asked, ‘what is that?’ I replied, ‘the statement (command) of Allah, then let them end their untidiness and fulfil their vows.’² He explained:

لِيَقْضُوا تَفَثَهُمْ لِقَاءَ الْإِمَامِ وَلِيُوفُوا نَذْرَهُمْ تِلْكَ الْمَنَاسِكُ

“Let them end their untidiness”, i.e. meeting the Imām, “and fulfil their vows,” i.e. those rites.

‘Abd Allah ibn Sinān says, “I went to Abū ‘Abd Allah عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and asked, ‘may I be sacrificed for you, (what is the explanation of the) command of Allah

1 Sūrah al-Ḥajj: 29

2 Sūrah al-Ḥajj: 29

سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, ‘Then let them end their untidiness and fulfill their vows?’” He replied:

ثُمَّ لِيَقْضُوا تَفَثَهُمْ وَلْيُوفُوا نُذُورَهُمْ قَالَ اخْذِ الشَّارِبَ وَاقْصِ الْأَظْفَارَ وَ مَا أَشْبَهَ ذَلِكَ

“Then let them end their untidiness and fulfil their vows,” means that the moustache should be removed, the nails should be clipped and all which resembles that (should be done).

قَالَ قُلْتُ جَعَلْتُ فِدَاكَ إِنْ ذَرِيحَا الْمُحَرَّبِي حَدَّثَنِي عَنْكَ بَانَكَ قُلْتُ لَهُ «لِيَقْضُوا تَفَثَهُمْ لِقَاءَ الْإِمَامِ وَلْيُوفُوا نُذُورَهُمْ تِلْكَ الْمَنَاسِكُ فَقَالَ صَدَقَ ذَرِيحٌ وَصَدَقْتُ إِنْ لِلْقُرْآنِ ظَاهِرًا وَبَاطِنًا وَمَنْ يَحْتَمِلُ مَا يَحْتَمِلُ ذَرِيحٌ

I said, “may I be sacrificed for you, Dharīḥ al-Muḥāribī related to me from you that you said to him, ‘let them end their untidiness’, i.e. meeting the Imām, ‘and fulfil their vows’ i.e. those rites.” He replied, “Dharīḥ has spoken the truth and I have (also) spoken the truth. Indeed the Qur’ān has an outer (meaning) and an inner. Who is capable of tolerating that which Dharīḥ tolerates?”¹

In this text, which is related by the author of *al-Kāfī*, the author of *Man lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* as well as others, it is clearly stated that the Qur’ān has an outer meaning which is to be told to the general public and an inner meaning that should only be mentioned to specific people, according to their ability to tolerate it. This text also informs us that these people are very few in number, and at times they do not even exist. It states, “who is capable of tolerating that which Dharīḥ tolerates?”

A third point that can be raised from this text is that the Imāms were, in a sense, stingy as far as this knowledge was concerned and they would only

1 Al-Kulaynī: *Furū‘ al-Kāfī* 4/549, Ibn Bābawayh: *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* 20/290-291, Ma‘ānī al-Akḥbār pg. 340, ‘Uyūn Akḥbār al-Riḍā pg. 366, al-Kāshānī: *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī* 3/376, al-Ḥuwayzī: *Tafsīr Nūr al-Thaqalayn* 2/492, al-Baḥrānī: *al-Burhān* 3/88-89, al-Majlisī: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/83-84, al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī: *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 10/253, al-Mūsawī: *Miftāḥ al-Kutub al-Arba‘ah* 5/228-229

reveal it to people who were on the level of Dharīḥ. Why then did the books of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah oppose this methodology of the Imāms? Why did they publish this ‘knowledge’ which was held back from the public in their books for one and all to have access to them?

One may also ask, “why do we not attribute the interpretations which conform to the apparent meanings, the context, the Arabic language, that which is related from the pious predecessors and that upon which the ummah has agreed to the Imāms? Why do we not believe that nothing other than that was uttered by the likes of Muḥammad al-Bāqir, Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq and the rest of them among whom were outstanding scholars of Islam and the Arabic language? Why do we not believe that the inner interpretations, which cannot be supported by any reliable evidence (the divine texts, the intellect and the usage of the Arabic language) is from the concoctions of the anti-religious atheists who wished to cause damage to the Book of Allah, His dīn and the Ahl al-Bayt, especially since these interpretations are as ludicrous as they are and they are only transmitted by a handful of people as indicated at the end of the above text?”

It is impossible that the interpretation of the Qur’ān could have been some secretive knowledge which was only accessible to a select few. This is because Allah revealed the Qur’ān for guidance of the entire humanity and not a specific group of people. Added to that, the era of these great Imāms was one wherein glory belonged to Islam and it was dominant. Thus, how is it that in an era like that, this ‘knowledge’ was kept a secret and in an era like ours it has become accessible to all? This is far-fetched, as the well-known fearlessness and bravery of the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt rule out the possibility that that they cowardly hid away the commands of Allah and His sharī‘ah and they shied away from openly proclaiming it!

5. These interpretations are nothing but an attempt to inject deviation in the Book of Allah and His verses. Allah ﷻ says:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يُلْحِدُونَ فِي آيَاتِنَا لَا يَخْفَوْنَ عَلَيْنَا ط

Indeed, those who inject deviation into Our verses are not concealed from Us.¹

Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه explained:

هو ان يوضع الكلام في غير موضعه و ذلك بالتحريف في تاويله

This is done by taking statements against their contexts², which is a result of misinterpreting them.³

It is mentioned in *al-Iklīl*:

In this is a refutation of those who interpret the Qur’ān in a way that is not accommodated by the meaning of the words, as the Bāṭiniyyah, Ittiḥādiyyah and heretics do.⁴

These people who try to corrupt the Qur’ān and distort its meanings, although they try to hide their kufr and hide behind false ideologies, they cannot remain hidden from Allah. He says, “(They) are not concealed from Us.”^{5,6}

6. The scholars of the Shī‘ah have attributed these interpretations, or rather distortions, to the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt so that they may be accepted by the masses. Since these interpretations make no sense, they wriggle their way out of this dilemma by asserting that the Qur’ān’s methodology

1 Sūrah al-Fuṣṣilat: 40

2 *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 24/123, *Fatḥ al-Qadīr* 4/520

3 Refer to al-Qāsimī: *Maḥāsīn al-Ta’wīl* 14/211, al-Ālūsī: *Rūḥ al-Ma’ānī* 24/126

4 Al-Sūyūṭī: *al-Iklīl* pg. 354 (printed with as a footnote to *Jāmi’ al-Bayān*)

5 Sūrah al-Fuṣṣilat: 40

6 Anwār Shāh al-Kashmīrī: *Ikfār al-Mulḥidīn* pg. 2

is not harmonious with the intellect. This too is attributed to an Imām, Ja'far al-Šādiq. Jābir al-Ju'fī reports that Ja'far al-Šādiq said to him:

يا جابر، إن للقرآن بطناً وللبطن ظهراً، ثم قال: وليس شيء أبعد من عقول الرجال منه، إن الآية لينزل أولها في شيء وآخرها في شيء وهو كلام متصل يتصرف على وجوه

O Jābir, Indeed the Qur'ān has an outer and an inner. There is nothing which is further away from the intellect of men than it. The first portion of a verse is revealed regarding one thing and the last portion is regarding another, but it is correlated speech which may be interpreted in many different ways.

There is no doubt that this is the condition of their interpretations (and not the Book of Allah), as they have no link at all with the text of the Qur'ān or its authentic and correct interpretations.

7. Most of their books on Tafsīr have adopted this Bāṭinī methodology of explanation, which they learnt from Abū al-Khaṭṭāb, Mughīrah ibn Sa'd and Jābir al-Ju'fī among other heretics. It seems as if they began trying to detach themselves from this methodology of Tafsīr to some extent in the fifth century. This was when the 'scholar of the sect' Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī (d. 460 A.H.) authored for them a Tafsīr in which he shed some light upon the correct interpretations by quoting Sunnī sources. No doubt, he also quoted their sources, however, he tried to water down or get away from the blatant extremism contained in *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, *al-'Ayyāshī*, *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*, etc.

Although he defends the principles of his sect and approves of their unfounded methods, he does not stoop to the same levels as al-Qummī and those who followed suit. Among those who treaded the path of al-Ṭūsī was Faḍl ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭabarsī in his book *Majma' al-Bayān*. Ibn Taymiyyah points this out saying:

Al-Ṭūsī and those like him take from the Ahl al-Sunnah as far as their Tafsīr is concerned. In fact all the beneficial information in their Tafsīr books is actually taken from the the Ahl al-Sunnah.¹

However, the leading scholar of the Shī'ah in his era, their muḥaddith, expert on the science of narrators, compiler of the latest and final collection of (their) aḥādīth — and the tutor of many of their senior scholars including Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā, Aghā Buzrug al-Tehrānī as well as others — Ḥusayn al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī divulged a secret that was always well hidden by them. He ripped apart the screen which kept us in the dark regarding an important reality, i.e. the book of al-Ṭūsī (*al-Tibyān*) was only written on account of Taqiyyah with the purpose of drawing the opposition closer. Here are his exact words:

ثم لا يخفى على المتأمل في كتاب التبيان أن طريقته فيه على نهاية المداراة والمماشاة مع المخالفين، فإنك تراه اقتصر في تفسير الآيات على نقل كلام الحسن وقتادة والضحاك والسدي وابن جريج والجبائي والزجاج، وابن زيد وأمثالهم. ولم ينقل عن أحد من مفسري الإمامية، ولم يذكر خبراً عن أحد من الأئمة - عليهم السلام - إلا قليلاً في بعض المواضع لعله وافقه في نقله المخالفون. بل عد الأولين في الطبقة الأولى من المفسرين الذين حمدت طرائقهم ومدحت مذاهبهم. وهو بمكان من الغرابة لو لم يكن على وجه المماشاة.. ومما يؤكد كون وضع هذا الكتاب على التقية ما ذكره السيد الجيل علي بن طاوس في سعد السعود وهذا لفظه: ”ونحن نذكر ما حكاه جدي أبو جعفر محمد بن الحسن الطوسي في كتاب «التبيان» وحملته التقية على الاقتصار عليه من تفضيل المكي على المدني والخلاف في أوقاته.. الخ. (هكذا لم يكمل النوري النص)

It will not remain hidden from the one who ponders over the book *al-Tibyān* that his (the author's) methodology therein is the epitome of compromising and toeing the line of the opposition, as you see him sufficing, as far as the commentary of verses are concerned, upon quoting the speech of Ḥasan, Qatādah, al-Ḍaḥḥāk, al-Suddī, Ibn Jurayj, al-Jubā'ī, al-Zujājī Ibn Zayd and their likes. He did not quote from any of the tafsīr scholars of the Imāmiyyah. He did not even mention narrations from any of the A'imma, except a few on some occasions, which perhaps the opposition agreed with

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/246

him regarding quoting them. In fact, he counted the first ones (the above mentioned mufasssīrīn) in the first category of Mufasssirs, whose methods are praised and their madh-habs commended. This is quite strange, if it was not done simply to toe the line (of the opposition)... Among that which supports the view that this book was written in Taqiyyah is the statement of the glorious master, ‘Alī ibn Ṭāwūs in Sa’d al-Sa’ūd. His exact words are:

We will mention that which my grandfather, Abū Ja’far Abū Ja’far Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī, relates in the book *al-Tibyān*. Complying with the demands of Taqiyyah, he sufficed upon it; granting superiority to the Makkī over the Madanī and differences regarding its times...¹

Thereafter, al-Nūrī comments on the quoted statement of Ibn Ṭāwūs saying:

وهو - يعني ابن طاوس - أعرف بما قال من وجوه لا يخفى على من اطلع على مقامه فتأمل

He (Ibn Ṭāwūs) knows best (the meaning) of his statement from angles which will not be vague for the one who realises his position. Thus ponder over it.²

The above text makes it quite clear that *al-Tibyān* of al-Ṭūsī was written with the purpose of Taqiyyah, as is the view of the leading scholar of present day Shī’ah. However, it is also possible that al-Ṭūsī wrote it to please the intellectuals who would not be impressed by the base and gross misinterpretations of the meanings of Qur’ān by his people, who had the nerve to call it Tafsīr. He could have also been influenced to adopt some moderation and fairness as a result of his intermingling with some of the Sunnī scholars of Baghdād.

1 Al-Nūrī did not quote the full text.

2 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 35 (page 17 of the manuscript copy)

This means that the Shi'ah of today, who could be represented by al-Nūrī (whose book —*Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* — they have accepted as their reliable source of ḥadīth¹ which proves his lofty standing in their eyes) are extremist fanatics of the highest level. This is why they view the *Tafsīr* of al-Ṭūsī and the books of those authors who treaded his path as works which were written only on account of the opposition. Thus, Taqiyyah was the soul of all of these writings, with the ultimate goal being merely to blend Shī'ī beliefs with the beliefs of non- Shī'ah.

The reader must have noticed, from the comments of the leading scholar of the Shī'ah regarding the book *al-Tibyān* that Taqiyyah was largely responsible for the consecration of extremism in this sect and burying every intelligent voice and unbiased view. These would simply be interpreted to be Taqiyyah, as they assumed them to be harmonious with the views of the Ahl al-Sunnah. The consequence of this was that this sect remained trapped in this locked cycle. Taqiyyah served as a fort behind which they would take shelter on every occasion that the breezes of rectification and the winds of change would blow in their direction, as will appear under the discussion of Taqiyyah.

We would also like to bring to the attention of the reader that whatever we stated regarding the book of al-Ṭūsī is also applicable to the book *Majma' al-Bayān* of al-Ṭabarsī, as he adopted the methodology of al-Ṭūsī. He admits this in the introduction of his *Tafsīr* saying:

...إلا ما جمعه الشيخ الأجل السعيد أبو جعفر محمد بن الحسن الطوسي قدس الله روحه من كتاب التبيان، فإنه الكتاب الذي يقتبس منه ضياء الحق ويلوح عليه رواء الصدق... وهو القدوة أستضيء بأنواره وأطأ مواقع آثاره

... except that which was gathered by the great and fortunate scholar Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī — may Allah sanctify his soul — in

1 Refer to the chapter “al-Sunnah” in this book.

the book *al-Tibyān*, as this is the book from which the light of the truth is obtained and the splendour of honesty is seen... He is the exemplary (personality) from whose illumination I seek light and in whose footsteps I walk.¹

1 *Majma' al-Bayān* 1/20

Discussion Three

Do the Shī'ah Believe that the Qur'ān was Interpolated?

A Preamble to the Subject:

This discussion begins with a question due to three reasons;

Firstly, many of the senior scholars of the Shī'ah, the likes of al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, Ibn Bābawayh a-Qummī, etc., distance themselves from this view.

Secondly, all Muslims are unanimous upon the belief (fact) that the Book of Allah is protected by Allah, who says:

لَا يَأْتِيهِ الْبَاطِلُ مِنْ بَيْنِ يَدَيْهِ وَلَا مِنْ خَلْفِهِ

Falsehood cannot approach it from before it or from behind it.¹

Thus, whoever entertains doubts regarding the protection of the Qur'ān from alterations and truncations is immediately cast out of the fold of Islam. This spells out to us the condition of one who firmly believes that alterations and truncations took place. Due to the severity of the consequences, it was binding upon us to take extra caution in this study of ours as far as attributing this type of disbelief to any sect. Therefore, the attributions which will follow were done after a meticulous research in which great caution was applied.

Thirdly, there is a group of intellectuals who attribute this kufr to the all the Shī'ah, without differentiating between them. This is undoubtedly incorrect, as there are many sects among the Shī'ah, and the sect passed through many phases. One cannot say, for example, that the early Shī'ah

1 Sūrah al-Fuṣṣilat: 42

held this belief.¹ Neither can it be said that the Zaydiyyah subscribe to this lie. Therefore, it is incorrect and unacceptable to generalise and attribute this belief to all the Shī'ah.

Nonetheless, a Muslim researcher is left aghast after setting his sight upon these malevolent and repugnant words which emerge from midgets who try to stretch their evil hands in an attempt to carry out an assault against the Book of Allah. It is only on the basis of necessity that a subject such as this is discussed. However, the reader should understand that a discussion regarding this subject cannot be written in defence of the Qur'ān, as the Qur'ān has no need to be defended. It is beyond the phantasms of those who have succumbed to wishful thinking and its grandeur is unaffected by the accusations of bigots and claimants who are driven by ulterior motives. Can the palm of a human ever conceal the Sun or the Moon?

A bigot who is taught that he had been wronged will not hesitate to present false claims. Hence, it does not befit us to scrutinise and refute every single claim that is made against us or our beliefs. The poet says:

If I place a stone in the mouth of every dog that barks, each gram would be
worth a gold coin.

Similarly, false beliefs and claims should be ignored and they should not be granted any attention, leaving them to fade away and disappear. However, once they become common, gain fame or they are adopted by any sect — especially when they are preserved in books — then it becomes necessary to expose the deviation of the one who uttered it as well as the falsity therein.

1 Iḥsān Ilāhī Ṣāhīr bought into the theory of the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, who claimed that none of the former Shī'ah rejected this belief except these four (i.e. Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, al-Murtaḍā, al-Ṭabarsī and al-Ṭūsī). Iḥsān says, “in a nutshell; the former as well as the latter Shī'ah, almost all of them, agreed upon the belief that the Qur'ān was changed and altered.” *Al-Shī'ah wa l-Sunnah* pg. 122, printed by Dār al-Anṣār. The reality is that this doctrine was introduced at a much later stage than the actual formation of the Shī'ah. The former Shī'ah were not upon this deviation and there are still some sects of the Shī'ah who do not accept this falsehood.

I deem it necessary to clarify, at this juncture, that the motive behind the study of this matter is not to refute and counter the belief of the opposition. Rather, it is only to establish whether or not the Shī'ah subscribe to this belief. If it is established to be their belief, they will be utterly disgraced and their foundations will be smashed to smithereens. Who will then accept anything that they say? Will any word that emerges from their mouths hold any weight? Is it possible that a Muslim takes the word or accepts the judgement of the one who attacks the Book of Allah?¹

Therefore, we are penning down this research so that the truth behind the attribution of this belief to the Shī'ah may come to the fore. This is because the one who wishes to lay any type of attack upon the Book of Allah and attempts to challenge its divinity is far out of the fold of Islam, even if insists that he should be called a Muslim. It is necessary to expose him so that the ummah can be aware of his enmity for Islam. He is attacking its extraordinary basis and its immovable foundation.

Merely attributing this view to the one who subscribes to it is sufficient, absolves us of the responsibility of refuting it, as stated by Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī.² This is because it is even logically impossible, on account of the amount and reliability of the measures that were kept in place to protect it, that the Qur'ān surrendered to any alterations or truncations. This was a fulfilment of the promise of Allah:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ

Indeed, it is We who sent down the message [i.e. the Quran], and indeed,
We will be its guardian.³

1 This is why we see that Ibn Ḥazm, when challenged by the Christians — who used that which is attributed to the Rāfiḍah as evidence to prove that the Qur'ān was interpolated — replied by saying that these people are not Muslims. They are a group who sprung up against Islam and the Muslims. The first sign of them was seen twenty five years after the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Refer to *al-Fiṣal* (2/80)

2 *I'jāz al-Qur'ān* pg. 24, researched by Aḥmad Ṣāqir

3 Sūrah al-Hijr: 9

Another aspect regarding this claim, which could also be found in Shī'ī circles (the extent to which they accept it or deny it will be studied as well) is that it was given birth to whilst the causes of its extinction and the proofs of its falsity and fallaciousness were already kept in it. Whoever concocted this view really did a putrid job. Therefore, it exposes and contradicts itself. The claim is that the Qur'ān is incomplete and that the complete Qur'ān, which is protected from any distortions was in the possession of Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام who then passed it on to the next Imām until it reached their hidden and awaited Mahdī.

Thus, this claim is intertwined with the personality of 'Alī عليه السلام. However, he is the one who decided that the Qur'ān should be the basis of judgements during his khilāfah, he recited it and he complied, believing that that is the only way to please Allah. If he had any other Qur'ān in his possession, he would have definitely shown it to the public. How could it be permissible for him to comply to a distorted book as far as seeking the pleasure of Allah was concerned?

If any of their claims had any truth to them, he would have definitely brought out the complete Qur'ān which he had gathered, compared it to the distorted one and solved the matter, especially during the days of his khilāfah. Any other possibility simply cannot be true, as the one who allows the masses to fall prey to the deception of another is just as guilty as the one who deceived them. Added to that, the issue on the basis of which he fought a war against Mu'āwiyah عليه السلام was a really minor issue compared to this one (even though it was sufficient a reason for the war to take place). Hence, it defies all logic to claim that Amīr al-Mu'minīn done nothing (publicly) to solve this issue.

The champions of this lie have no answer to this crucial question, which destroys their foundations, besides a statement of their scholar Ni'mat Allāh al-Jazā'irī¹:

1 He holds an extremely lofty position according to them. They have showered him with a many honorary titles such as *al-Sayyid* (the master), *al-Sanad* (the pillar of support), *al-Rukn al-Mu'tamad* (the reliable pillar of support), *al-Muḥaddith al-Nabīh*, *al-Muḥaqqiq*, *al-Niḥrīr* and *al-Mudaqqiq al-'Azīz al-Naẓīr*. They believe that he was among the most senior scholars of the latter day Ithnā 'Ashariyyah, a great and invaluable Muḥaddith, an outstanding researcher, etc. He died in the year 1112 A.H. Refer to *Amal al-Āmāl* 2/336, *al-Kunnā wa l-Alqāb* 3/298, *Safinat Al-Bihār* 2/601, *Muqaddimah Al-Anwār al-Nu'māniyyah*.

ولما جلس أمير المؤمنين - عليه السلام - على سرير الخلافة لم يتمكن من إظهار ذلك القرآن وإخفاء هذا
لما فيه من إظهار الشنعة على من سبقه

When Amīr al-Mu'minīn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام sat upon the seat of khilāfah, he could not present this Qur'ān and hide that one as it meant open disparagement of those who preceded him.¹

This is their answer and excuse! Can there be a greater attack and insult against the personality of Amīr al-Mu'minīn — from those who claim to be his ardent supporters? They accuse him of preferring diplomacy in the matter of those who preceded him over the guidance of the ummah! This is the only reason why he did not show the public the Qur'ān that he had in his possession. Glory be to Allah, indeed this is a horrendous accusation!

Amongst the many sad but laughable aspects of this doctrine is that the second personality with whom it is intertwined is their hidden Imām, whose birth and existence can never be established (as will be proven later). Both, the hidden Imām as well as the hidden copy of the Qur'ān are nothing but figments of their imagination. Furthermore, the words that they have managed to put together, which they present as verses that have been discarded from the copies of the Qur'ān further expose the lack of substance of this claim.

The closest match to these sentences are the claims of the great liar and imposter, Musaylamah. You will not be able to make sense of these statements in light of the Arabic language, and the eloquence thereof refutes all possibilities of it being accurate. Later, they decided to cover their tracks by claiming that these sentences cannot be relied upon, they should not be considered as part of the Qur'ān and it is impermissible to recite them as they are transmitted by very few people at some point. Also, the Imāms recited this Qur'ān (the original Qur'ān, which they disbelieve in) and used it, so it is not permissible to leave out that which they have agreed upon on the basis of this type of narrations.

1 *Al-Anwār al-Nu'māniyyah* 2/326

Thereafter, a group from them who blessed with some intelligence dissociated themselves from this kufr, as they saw the stark contradictions in it as well the clear falsity thereof. Subsequently, they publicised its falsity and ridiculed those who subscribed to it. In this way, Allah lifted this burden off the shoulders of the Muslims. This war between the two groups (the Shī'ah who subscribe to this belief and those who do not) appears in the book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*. Further details will be mentioned later, if Allah wills.

To sum up the above, this belief is self-contradictory and its falsity has been exposed through the statements of those who believe in it as well. This is a great sign for the Muslims, and a clear proof as far as the grandeur of the Qur'ān is concerned. It is a manifestation of one of the secrets of its miraculous nature, which cannot be completely comprehended by the intellect. This belief and the matters around it are a demonstration of the fulfilment of the promise of Allah by Him, to guard His Book.

Next, we will study the stance of the Shī'ah on this matter, when it started, how it spread and remained, who is the one who had the greatest share in concocting it and is it the belief of all the Shī'ah, or are there some amongst them who reject it and dissociate themselves from it? We will start off by quoting that which is mentioned in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, after which these quotations will be judged or proven by that which is mentioned in the books of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah.

The Birth of this Doctrine – as Stated in the Books of the Ahl al-Sunnah

Imām Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim al-Anbārī¹ says:

The honourable and intelligent ones have always honoured the nobility of the Qur'ān and admitted its lofty status... it is only in this era of ours

1 Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim ibn Muḥammad, Abu Bakr al-Anbārī. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī says, "he was a truthful, virtuous, pious and from the Ahl al-Sunnah. He authored many books on the sciences of the Qur'ān, Waqf, Ibtidā and he wrote books in refutation of those who opposed the common copy of the Qur'ān. He was among the most learned of people regarding the linguistic aspects and tafsīr of the Qur'ān." Refer to *Tārīkh Baghdād* 3/181-186.

that one who had deviated from the religion and attacked the ummah by means of that with which he wishes to annul the sharī'ah has risen his head... he claims that the copy which was gathered by 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه and authenticated by all the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم is not the complete Qur'ān. Rather, five hundred letters have been deleted from it.

Thereafter Ibn al-Anbārī mentions:

This irreligious one began reciting verses of the Qur'ān against the way in which they were (revealed). He would recite:

ولقد نصركم الله ببدر بسيف علي وأنتم أذلة

Indeed Allah helped you at Badr by means of the sword of 'Alī, when you were disgraced.¹

This was stated by Ibn al-Anbārī who was born in the year 271 A.H. and he passed away in the year 328 A.H. This indicates that the belief was given birth to at the end of the third century and the beginning of the fourth century. The above text also indicated that this belief was concocted by the Shī'ah, hence the words “the sword of 'Alī”. A third point indicated in this text is that the Muslim ummah had not heard of beliefs of this kind prior to the appearance of this irreligious individual. It seems as if Ibn al-Anbārī is referring to a specific person, but for some reason, he does not name him. However, his sectarian inclinations could be gauged from the words of his concoctions.

Al-Milṭī (d. 377 A.H.) indicates that this concoction was the work of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam.² He claimed that the Qur'ān which is in the hands of the Muslims was

1 *Tafsīr al-Qurṭubī* 1/82

2 He was of Kūfī origin. He stayed in Baghdad and he grew up in the care of some heretics. Initially, he subscribed to the beliefs of the Jahmiyyah, after which he adopted the belief of Tajsīm (anthropomorphism)... many deviant beliefs have been reported from him. The Shī'ah Hishāmiyyah attribute books regarding sects to him. He died in the year 179 A.H. as stated in *Rijāl al-Kashshī*.

created during the days of ‘Uthmān. As for the true Qur’ān, it was raised to the heavens on account of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ turning renegade (as he believes).¹ Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam died in the year 190 A.H., which means that this concocted belief began before the date indicated by Ibn al-Anbārī.

If we ponder over the fact that this lie has a strong connection with the doctrine of Imāmah and the Imāms, which is a belief of the Shī‘ah, as well as the fact the scholars of the Shī‘ah had to hunt for proofs of this doctrine in the Qur’ān (which contains none) and they could not find anything to prove their claims, they were compelled to accept this concoction as well as others. If we ponder over all of this, then the view of al-Milṭī, that Hishām is the one who concocted this view, makes perfect sense, especially since he was also among the first ones to speak regarding Imāmah. Ibn al-Nadīm stated that Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam was among those who broke the silence on the matter of Imāmah and among his books was *Kitāb al-Imāmah*.²

Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī says:

وكان ممن فتن الكلام في الإمامة وهذب المذهب بالنظر

He was among those who broke the silence regarding Imāmah, and he systemised the madh-hab on the basis of logic.³

Another reason, on the basis of which, we are allowed to believe that Hishām was the one who concocted this view is the following text which appears in *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, the prime book of the Shī‘ah on the subject of biographies:

continued from page 273

It is also stated that he died in the year 190 A.H, refer to *Rijāl al-Kashshī* 255-280, *Rijāl al-Najāshī* pg. 338, Ibn Hajar: *Lisān al-Mizān* 6/194. Regarding the Hishāmiyyah, here are some books to which you may refer al-Milṭī: *al-Tanbīh wa l-Radd* pg. 24, al-Ash‘arī: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/106, al-Baghdādī: *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg. 65, al-Shahrastānī: *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* 1/184.

1 *Al-Tanbīh wa al-Radd* pg. 25

2 *Al-Fahrist* pg. 175

3 *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 178

هشام بن الحكم من غلمان أبي شاكِر، وأبو شاكِر زنديق

Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam was from the students of Abū Shākir, and Abū Shākir was a zindīq.^{1,2}

Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār, the Mu‘tazilī, states:

هشام... ليس من أهل القبلة، وهو معروف بعداوة الأنبياء، وقد أخذ مع أبي شاكِر الديصاني

Hishām... he was not from the Ahl al-Qiblah. He was infamous for his hatred for the ambiyā’. He was a companion of Abū Ja‘far al-Dayṣānī.³ (The leader of the Daysāniyyah).⁴

He was associated with him and he was his companion, however he claimed that he belonged to the Shī‘ah and he is a supporter of the Banu Hāshim. Consequently, some of the companions of al-Mahdī al-‘Abbāsī set him free and did not imprison him along with the Abū Shākir.⁵ He was a man who was nurtured by the zindīqs, thus it came as no surprise that he followed in their footsteps. He was advised — as recorded in *Rijāl al-Kashshī* — to adopt silence when al-Mahdī al-‘Abbāsī started a campaign to crackdown upon all the Zindīqs.⁶ Hishām says:

فكففت عن الكلام حتى مات المهدي

Thus, I did not speak at all until al-Mahdī passed away.⁷

1 A person who claims to be Muslim, but holds such beliefs which cast him out of the fold of Islam.

2 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 278

3 Refer to Ibn al-Nadīm: *al-Fahrist* pg. 338

4 A group of idolaters who believe in the two principles; light and darkness, and that the world emerged from them. It is regarded as the foundation of Mānūyah. The two sects only differ regarding the manner in which light mixes with darkness. *Al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* 1/250, Ibn al-Nadīm: *al-Fahrist* pg. 338, 339

5 *Tathbīt Dalā’il al-Nubuwwah* pg. 225

6 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 265-256

7 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 266

All of these signs indicate that Hishām and his group were the culprits. The least that this text proves is that this belief was introduced in the era of Hishām. Another text which indicates that this belief existed at that time is that which Ibn Ḥazm reports from al-Jāḥiẓ:

أخبرني أبو إسحاق إبراهيم النظام وبشر بن خالد أنهما قالَا لمحمد بن جعفر الرافضي المعروف بشيطان الطاق: ويحك! أما استحييت من الله أن تقول في كتابك في الإمامة: إن الله تعالى لم يقل قط في القرآن: ثَانِي اثْنَيْنِ إِذْ هُمَا فِي الْعَارِ إِذْ يَقُولُ لِصَاحِبِهِ لَا تَحْزَنْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ مَعَنَا قَالَا: فضحك والله شيطان الطاق طويلاً حتى كأننا نحن الذي أذنبنا

Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm al-Niẓām and Bishr ibn Khālīd informed me that they said to Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far¹ the Rāfiḍī who was famously known as *Shayṭān al-Ṭāq* (the devil of the arch), “woe unto you! Do you not feel ashamed before Allah. You stated in your book regarding Imāmah that Allah did not ever say in the Qur’ān “one of two, when they were in the cave and he [i.e., Muḥammad ﷺ] said to his companion, ‘Do not grieve; indeed Allah is with us.’”² They related, “by the oath of Allah, Shayṭān al-Ṭāq let out such a prolonged laugh, as if we were the ones who sinned.”³

This narration is reported by Ibn Ḥazm who quotes al-Jāḥiẓ. Ibn Ḥazm states regarding al-Jāḥiẓ, after considering him to be a deviate:

We have not seen him lying intentionally in his books or establishing them, although he does quote many lies of other people.⁴

Shayṭān al-Ṭāq was the title of Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Nu‘mān Abū Ja‘far al-Aḥwal. He died in the year 160 A.H.⁵ It is well known that Shayṭān al-Ṭāq was a contemporary of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam. Ibn Ḥajar says:

1 This name appears in the researched copy of *al-Fiṣal*. However, the more correct name would be Abu Ja‘far, as his father was ‘Alī. This is stated in the books regarding biographies.

2 Sūrah al-Towbah: 40

3 *Al-Fiṣal* 5/39

4 *Al-Fiṣal* 5/39

5 The following statement, among other deviate beliefs, is attributed to him, “Allah does not know of an occurrence until it takes place.” The sects Shayṭāniyyah and Nu‘māniyyah, from the extremist Shī‘ah are attributed to him. Refer to *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 185, *Rijāl al-Najāshī* pg. 249, *Lisān al-Mīzān* 5/300-301, *Firaq al-Shī‘ah* of al-Nawbakhtī pg. 78, *Safīnat Al-Bihār* 1/323, *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/111, *al-Milal wa al-Niḥāl* 1/186, *Al-Intiṣār* by Ibn al-Khayyāt pg. 14-48

It is said that when Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam, the leader of the Rāfiḍah, was informed that they gave him the title Shayṭān al-Ṭāq, he named him (from his side) Mu'min al-Ṭāq.

Thus, he could have been one of Hishāms accomplices as far as this concoction is concerned, just as he had his share in writing on the subject of Imāmah — the main cause and basis of this concoction, as indicated by the texts of thereof.

The Spread of this Belief Amongst Them – as Explained in the Books of the Ahl al-Sunnah

Thereafter, this belief spread amongst the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah, who are referred to by al-Ash'arī and others as al-Rāfiḍah until it became — as mentioned by al-Ash'arī (d. 330 A.H) — the view of a group of these Rawāfiḍ. They claimed that (words) of the Qur'ān were deleted. As far as additions are concerned, they accepted that it was impossible to have happened. Similarly, they believed that it was impossible for anything in it to have been changed. However much of it was deleted, but the Imām has complete knowledge regarding it.¹

Another group, who al-Ash'arī describes as people who married Imāmah and I'tizāl chose to refute this belief. They stated, “nothing was deleted from the Qur'ān and nothing was added to it. It is exactly as Allah revealed it to His Nabī ﷺ. it was not changed or altered. It has always been in its original form.”² There is a third group, which apparently, has been omitted.³

1 *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/119-120

2 *Ibid* 1/119-120

3 This is the impression we get from the printed version of *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*, which was researched by Muḥammad Muḥy al-Dīn 'Abd al-Ḥamīd (vol. 1 pg. 120). The other print of the book, which was researched by Helmut Rueter, states that the researcher found a footnote in some of the manuscripts which reads, “one group was omitted from the sequence and the count. They are those who accept that additions could have been made but not deletions.” Refer to the footnote of *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* (pg. 47), researched by Helmut Reuter. This is at times the action of the one who copied the book, as he did not find any of the Shī'ah subscribing to this belief. Al-Ṭūsī has mentioned in *al-Tibyān* and al-Ṭabarsī in *Majma' al-Bayān* (1/30) that it is agreed upon, in their circles, that additions are impossible.

Al-Baghdādī (d. 429 A.H.) indicates that the Rāfiḍah are the ones who claim that the Ṣaḥābah distorted some portions of the Qur’ān and changed others. He cited this as one of the reasons for it being incumbent to declare them disbelievers (kāfir) and state that they have left the fold of Islam.¹ It seems as if this drivel took root amongst majority of members of this sect to the extent that Ibn Ḥazm (d. 465 A.H.) ascribes this belief to all the groups of the Imāmiyyah, excluding only three of their influential scholars, who were saved from falling into this profanity.²

Similarly, Qāḍī Abu Ya’lā (d. 458 A.H.) attributes this belief to the Rāfiḍah³, which is one of the names of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah, as explained. However, we find that Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 A.H) attributed this belief to the Bāṭiniyyah. He states:

Similarly (the judgement of Kufr will be passed against) those who believe that the verses of the Qur’ān were deleted, hidden, has a secret interpretation, etc. These people are named al-Qarāmiṭah and al-Bāṭiniyyah.⁴

It is unclear whether Ibn Taymiyyah considered the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah to be from the Bāṭiniyyah or it slipped him that they hold this view, which is why he did not mention them. It is also possible that he was concentrating specifically upon the last cause, i.e. secret interpretations which is firmly upheld by the al-Qarāmiṭah al-Bāṭiniyyah. Whatever the case may be, I did not come across in the writings

1 Refer to *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq*

2 Refer to *al-Fiṣal* 5/40

3 *Al-Mu’tamad fī Uṣūl al-Dīn* pg. 258. Qāḍī Abū Ya’lā explains the ignorance required to end up making a claim the like of this one, wherein the Rawāfiḍ have denied the obvious and that which is reported by almost everyone. This is because the Qur’ān was compiled (in the form of a book, as previously it was memorised and written, but not in one place in the form of a book) in the presence of the Ṣaḥābah among whom was ‘Alī عليه السلام. All of them agreed upon it, without any objections raised. It is impossible, even according to the norms of society, that if they did delete or change anything, there would be no objections, at least. Most definitely ‘Alī عليه السلام and others would have said something. However, the reality is that he recited it and applied it! (*al-Mu’tamad* pg. 258)

4 *Al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl* pg. 586

of Ibn Taymiyyah, as far as what I have read in *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (which was a rebuttal of their scholar Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī) and his other published works that he attributes this belief to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah.

Mīrzā Makhdūm al-Shīrāzī (of the tenth century) reveals to us (as he lived amongst the Shī‘ah and he read many of their books — as stated by him¹):

They mention in their books of ḥadīth and their textbooks on doctrine that ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه deleted verses of the Qur’ān, according to them.

Thereafter he cites a few examples. Among them is the following claim regarding Sūrah al-Inshirāḥ:

After the verse:

وَرَفَعْنَا لَكَ ذِكْرَكَ

And raised high for you your repute.²

Allah said:

وَعَلِيَ صِهْرُكَ

And ‘Alī is your son in law.³

1 He mentions that he was forced to live amongst them due to which he had no choice but to mingle with them and read their books... This is how he came to find out their false beliefs and concoctions. Refer to *al-Nawāqīḍ* (scroll 110, 151 and 165 of the manuscript). He goes on to say, “none discovered the details of their books, beliefs and the explanations of their habits and actions in the way that I have. Thus, they cannot say, ‘he lied against us.’ As they claim regarding that which is attributed to the Rāfiḍah in the books of doctrine authored by our predecessors.” (scroll 87)

2 Sūrah al-Inshirāḥ: 4

3 *Al-Nawāqīḍ* scroll 103. Shaykh Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb states: “They do not feel shy to make this claim despite knowing that this surah was revealed in Makkah, and the only son in law of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم at that time was al-‘Āṣ ibn al-Rabī‘ al-Umawī!” *al-Khuṭūṭ al-‘Arīḍah* pg. 15

Muṭahhar ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Alī ibn Ismā‘īl, in his book *Takfīr al-Shī‘ah* (which was authored in the year 990 A.H.), mentions that the Shī‘ah of his era burnt copies of the Qur’ān, showed gross disrespect to it and they produced a new version thereof.¹ A personality from the thirteenth century indicates towards the statements of the Shī‘ah regarding the interpolation of the Qur’ān, after which he states that the word was going around in his era that the Shī‘ah produced two Sūrahs, claiming that these were hidden by ‘Uthmān; each of these Sūrahs were equivalent to a juz of the Qur’ān. They were added to the end of the Qur’ān and their names were Sūrah al-Nūrayn and Sūrah al-Walā.²

This matter is further clarified by the author of *al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah*, Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Dehlawī (d. 1239 A.H.) who states that the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah believe that the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم changed the Book of Allah and deleted from it that which was related to the virtues of ‘Alī عليه السلام and their other Imāms as well as that which was related to their enemies. He then quotes a few examples to prove this from their books. He explains that by doing so, they have opposed the divine texts, logic, that which is obvious to the one who has any knowledge regarding Islam as well as the undisputed and authentic accounts of history. He also states that the Ahl al-Bayt were free of this heresy and that some of the scholars of the Shī‘ah, the likes of Ibn Bābawayh began rejecting it.³

Abū al-Thanā al-Ālusī (d. 1270 A.H.) touches upon the subject in his *Tafsīr*. He quotes a few examples from their books, followed by an explanation of their falsity on the basis of the impeccable systems that were put in place to guarantee its protection. They were such that a mu’min is left convinced that no portion

1 *Takfīr al-Shī‘ah*, scroll 58 (of the manuscript). He mentioned this under the chapter, “the chapter regarding Tahmasp the illegitimate, his irreligiousness and an explanation of his disbelief and blasphemy.” Tahmasp was the son of Shāh Ismā‘īl ibn Ḥaydar al-Ṣafawī. He was born in the year 919 A.H. and he was one of the kings of the Ṣafawid dynasty. He occupied the throne after the death of his father, in the year 930 A.H., and he belonged to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. Refer to *Dā‘irat al-Ma‘ārif (al-Shī‘ah)* vol. 6 pg. 321.

2 Refer to *Risālat al-Radd ‘alā al-Rāfiḍah* pg. 14

3 Refer to *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah* pg. 82, 30, 50, 52.

of this Qur'ān could have been left unprotected and deleted. If anyone doubts this, he will go on to doubt many other aspects of the dīn which are established beyond doubt.

He further states that when some of their scholars realised the drastic consequences of such a view, they jumped out of the cauldron by stating that it is only a few of their scholars. As proof, he cited the statements of the leading scholar of the Shī'ah al-Ṭabarsī, which appears in *Majma' al-Bayān* that the Shī'ah reject this view and it is only the view of a group from amongst them. The contradictory view is the accurate one. Thereafter al-Ālūsī comments, “this is a statement which he was forced to make on account of the obviousness — even to children — of the falsity of the view held by his companions. Praise be to Allah upon the triumph of the truth, and Allah removed the burden of countering them from the Muslims.”¹

Perhaps al-Ālūsī (Abū al-Thana) was the first person to write on the subject so extensively (compared to others) in Arabic, as he added to his study of this fabrication direct quotations from their own sources. He quoted their narrations verbatim from *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* and other books. He also mentioned the other view held by some of the Shī'ah who rejected this lie, used their statements as proof and analysed it as well. His grandson, the leading scholar of Iraq, Abū al-Ma'ālī al-Ālūsī (d. 1342) followed in his footsteps by explaining that the Shī'ah fell prey to this kufr, in his booklets which he compiled or summarised regarding the Shī'ah.

Muḥammad Rashīd Riḍā (d. 1352 A.H.) was the next person to discuss this matter. He disgraces the Shī'ah time and again in his magazine, *al-Manār*², and thereafter in his booklet *al-Sunnah wa al-Shī'ah*. He did this after being provoked, or rather, forced by the fanaticism and enmity of some of the scholars of the Shī'ah — as said by him. He mentions that the Rāfiḍah Shī'ah claim that whatever is between the

1 *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī* 1/33

2 Refer to vol. 29 pg. 436

two covers is not the speech of Allah. Instead, the Ṣaḥābah, according to them, deleted some verses as well as the Sūrah of Wilāyah.¹

Thereafter came Mūsā Jār Allah (d. 1369 A.H.) who lived among the Shī'ah for a while, explored their cities, attended their lessons in the Maṣjids classrooms and houses and read many of their important books.² He was of the view that the belief of the Qur'ān being distorted by deleting a few words and verses which were revealed as well as by changing the sequence of the words and verses is something that is agreed upon in the books of the Shī'ah.³

These words and verses, as they claim, were regarding 'Alī and his progeny ﷺ. They were deleted by the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. He goes on to quote Shī' scholars who claim that the narrations concerning this lie are of the highest degree of authenticity, according to them. Rejecting these narrations would necessitate the rejection of all their narrations regarding Imāmah, Raj'ah, etc. All of them will then be declared false.⁴

He noticed, during his stay among the Shī'ah at that time, the ill-effects of this belief upon the Shī'ī population, as none of the students or scholars had memorised the Qur'ān. They could not even articulate the words correctly, or even to some extent. They had abandoned the Qur'ān completely.⁵ He then asks, "is this because

1 *Al-Sunnah wa l-Shī'ah* pg. 43

2 *Al-Washī'ah* pg. 25-26

3 *Al-Washī'ah* pg. 104

4 *Al-Washī'ah* pg. 138

5 He sought some information regarding this glaring calamity from some of the scholars of the Shī'ah in the form of a small paper upon which he wrote (questions) regarding this matter as well as others, but he found no one to answer him. Refer to *Al-Washī'ah* pg. 27-28. Thereafter, he wrote a booklet in which he mentioned many of the false Shī'ī beliefs and he presented it to leader of the mujtahids of the Kāẓimīyyah of Baghdād. Copies of this were made and distributed by al-Rābi'at al-'Ilmiyyah to the lecturers of Najaf. He mentions that after waiting for more than a year, he received no reply from the mujtahids of the Shī'ah. It was only the grand mujtahid of the Shah of Baghdād who responded with a ninety page dictionary of vulgarity, directed towards the first century and its people. His language therein was amazingly worse than that which was already contained in the books of the Shī'ah. *Al-Washī'ah* pg. 98, 117-118.

they are waiting for that which they have been promised in their fairy tales, that the complete Qur’ān will appear with their awaited and promised Mahdī?”¹

Later, Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb (d. 1389 A.H.), on account of the Shī’ah establishing Dār al-Taqrīb Bayn al-Madhāhib al-Islāmiyyah in the land of Kinānah, as a ploy to spread their belief of Rafḍ among its inhabitants, began writing about them in his magazine *al-Faṭḥ* and in his booklet *al-Khuṭūṭ al-‘Arīḍah*. He discusses this lie and he cites as proof that which appears in the book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb fī Ithbāt Taḥrīf Kitāb Rabb al-Arbāb* (the decisive speech in proving that alterations took place in the book of the Rabb of all masters).

The author of this book was Mīrzā Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad Taqī al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, one of the senior scholars of Najaf, who was honoured by the Shī’ah to such an extent that upon his expiry (in the year 1320 A.H.), they buried him in the most blessed land according to them. He says that this book includes hundreds of narrations from their scholars which are contained in their reliable books, which establish that they were convinced that alterations took place and they believed in the idea without any reservations.

He also cites as proof the narrations which appear in the book *al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī, which holds the same position among them as *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* holds among the Ahl al-Sunnah. A picture of ‘Sūrah al-Wilāyah’ is presented by him, which he says is a photo of one of the copies of the Qur’ān in Iran. Thereafter he says, “there are two Qur’āns; one is common and known and the other is hidden and it is a special one. Sūrah al-Wilāyah is from the second one. He then quotes as proof a text which appears in their verdicts regarding recitation from the ‘Uthmānī Muṣḥaf (copies which comply with the script of the Qur’ān which were revealed to Rasūlullāh ﷺ and written out in the era of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ). He then says that the elite members of the Shī’ah teach one another that which opposes it (the ‘Uthmānī Muṣḥaf), claiming that this (which they teach) is preserved by the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt.”²

1 Refer to pg. 30-31, 112.

2 *Al-Khuṭūṭ al-‘Arīḍah* pg. 10-19

Similarly, Shaykh Maḥmūd al-Māl Allāh (d. 1389 A.H.) disgraced the Shī'ah in Iraq as far as this matter was concerned, in an effort to counter their scholar al-Khālīsī, who attempted to spread Rafḍ under the banner of Islamic unity.¹ Following in the footsteps of all of these scholars, Iḥsān Ilāhī Ṣāḥib wrote on this subject in his book *al-Shī'ah wa l-Sunnah*. He held the view that al the Shī'ah were entrapped in this kufr. He quotes extensively from their books, which contain the narrations of this fabrication. He believed that whoever rejected this view from them, done so due to Taqiyyah, not because they really believed so. He then says that he explained this matter in an unambiguous manner and he backed his views with proofs in a way that was never done before.²

Iḥsān then wished to delve further into the issue, so he wrote the book *al-Shī'ah wa l-Qur'ān*. Herein, he arrives at the exact same conclusion as he arrived at in his previous book. Most of this book is simply a word for word quotation, without any comments or footnotes, of the book which is second to none among the books of the Shī'ah as far as covering this fabrication is concerned, i.e. *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb fī Ithbāt Taḥrīf Kitāb Rabb al-Arbāb*.

Strangely, Iḥsān Ilāhī Ṣāḥib arrives at the exact same conclusion as the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, even though the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, as will appear, only wrote his book to pacify a group of his brethren who rejected this kufr and refused to swallow it, citing as proof that which some of their earlier scholars stated in rejecting this lie. Thus, the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* wished to disprove their arguments by means of this book. Therefore, he claimed that the denial of the former scholars was nothing but Taqiyyah, or their lack of sufficient sources, as will appear.

Iḥsān adopted the exact same view as the author³ and Ni'mat Allah al-Jazā'irī, that those who rejected this view done so only on the basis of Taqiyyah. The

1 Refer to his book *al-Waḥdat al-Islāmiyyah bayn al-Akdh wa l-Radd*

2 *Al-Sunnah wa l-Shī'ah* pg. 14

3 In the book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* it becomes clear that there are two groups among the Shī'ah. One group beliefs in the lie, claiming that all those who denied it done so on account of taqiyyah. They claim that there is consensus among the Shī'ah regarding this kufr. The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, who — as stated — wrote this book specifically to refute the opposite view, supports this view (that it has been interpolated).

discussion and study of this subject will appear. Muḥammad Māl Allāh also wrote a book titled *al-Shī'ah wa Taḥrīf al-Qur'ān*, in which he arrived at the conclusion that the scholars of the Shī'ah agreed upon the acceptance of this lie, citing as proof the statements of twelve of their scholars who accepted it. He did not indicate that there is a difference of opinion regarding this among them, even though a group of their scholars had rejected it.

Added to that, he cited as proof, two hundred of their narrations as examples of Shī'ī alterations to the Qur'ān. Similarly, he prepared a table regarding this, which he included in his commentary on the book *al-Khuṭūṭ al-'Arīḍah*. This appears at the end of the book. These were extracted from some of the books of tafsīr and ḥadīth of the Shī'ah. However, some of these examples are not clear in this regard (i.e. being alterations) and they could very easily be placed in the category of interpretations. Another huge error committed by him, which was committed by Iḥsān before him, was that he mentioned some narrations of the Shī'ah in which variations of the recital of verses (which were reported by the pious predecessors as well) were reported and he ignorantly dismissed them as alterations.

The root cause of this problem was that they relied, without any reservation or thought, upon the book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*. There are other books as well, the authors of which fell prey to the same folly.¹ One of the most active personalities regarding

continued from page 284

The other group rejects this lie and also claims that there is consensus regarding this belief. They quote strong proofs to support their view. However, the author of *al-Shī'ah wa l-Qur'ān* did not mention the proofs of this group, sufficing upon the proofs of the first group without any comments attached to it. It is as if he considered it unnecessary to mention this aspect on account of him believing that it was done only on the basis of Taqīyyah. Undoubtedly, the demand of honesty would be that both sides were given equal attention. Also, by mentioning both sides, many matters regarding the inconsistency and falsity of the madh-hab become quite clear.

1 Such as the book *Wa Jā'a Dawr al-Majūs* (page 114) states that their rejection of alterations is Taqīyyah as they believe that the first three khulafā', as well as the majority of the Ṣaḥābah were treacherous hypocrites, and the Qur'ān reached us by means of them. Another reason he cites to believe so is that they ask Allah to send mercy upon their scholars who openly state the opposite view. (page 117)

the problem of Shī'ism, Dr 'Alī Aḥmad al-Sālūs, disagrees with Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb and others who attribute this view to all the Shī'ah. He is of the view that it is confined to the Akhbārīs. As for the Uṣūlīs, they reject this view. However, he is not totally convinced of the accuracy of this categorisation, as he asked one of the *Marja's* (title of the high ranking Shī'ī scholars) of the Akhbārīs regarding this. The reply received by him was that alterations took place in the meanings only, not in the words. Dr Sālūs says, "he gave me a booklet which he wrote as a commentary upon a view which attacked the Shī'ah. The following also appears in this book:

مذهبنَا - ومذهب كل مسلم - بأن القرآن الكريم المتداول بين أيدينا ليس فيه أي تحريف بزيادة أو نقصان، وما ذكر في بعض الأحاديث بأن فيه تحريفاً ونقصاناً فهو مخالف لعقيدتنا في القرآن الكريم الذي هو الذكر الحكيم، والذي لا يأتيه الباطل من بين يديه ولا من خلفه

Our view, and the view of every Muslim is that the Noble Qur'ān, which is common amongst us was not altered in any way, neither by additions nor by deletions. That which is mentioned in some aḥādīth books, that there were alterations made to it and deletions took place, is in contrast to our beliefs regarding the Noble Qur'ān, which is the Wise Reminder. Falsehood cannot approach it from before it or from behind it.

Dr Sālūs continues, "perhaps those who accept this lie are a group from the Akhbārīs, not all of them. The other possibility is that the statement mentioned in that booklet was stated on the basis of Taqiyyah." He then attempts to prove this by another statement which appeared in the very same book, which will be reproduced hereunder:

لم يقل الشيعة وأئمتهم بما يحط من كرامة الخلفاء المرضيين.. وقد أجزى الفتح والخير للمسلمين على يد أولئك الصالحين - عليهم سلام الله ورحمته ورضوانه أجمعين

The Shī'ah and their Imāms have never uttered any derogatory statements regarding the Khulafā' with whom everyone was happy... Indeed conquests and goodness became the lot of the Muslims at the hands of those pious ones. May the salutations of Allah, His mercy and His pleasure be upon all of them.

Dr Sālūs then goes on to say that it is clear and obvious that this is not the belief of the Shī'ah.¹ Nonetheless, the scholars of Pakistan and India have also exerted themselves in exposing this great lie from the books of the Shī'ah, and bringing this to the attention of the Muslims. However their works are not in Arabic.² This brings us to the end of the brief report on the work that took place against the lie under discussion. We cannot afford to carry out a detailed evaluation of these works, as this will be a digression from our actual topic.

I will endeavour to pen down a discussion regarding this subject from a different perspective, i.e. by studying and discussing its foundations and roots, its historical record and the opening of the road for this evil concoction to make its entrance, be heard and analysed. I have not come across anyone, thus far who has done this. I will also add a few matters, related to this topic, which have not yet been discussed.

Before lifting my pen regarding this subject, I wish to point out that some Shī'ī scholars whine and bellow, claiming that they have been oppressed concerning this subject, and that they are totally innocent. So what is the reality of the matter? We have seen a person who affiliates himself with the Ahl al-Sunnah³, whose fervour drove him to gather all that is mentioned in the books of Iḥsān Ilāhī Ṣāḥib and Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb, along with their references and present it to one of the scholars of the Shī'ah⁴ — seeking a response from him regarding it.

The Shī'īs answer included the following text:

سلامة القرآن الكريم من التحريف موضع اتفاق وإجماع علماء الشيعة الإمامية، ومن شذ منهم في هذه المسألة فلا يعاباً برأيه كما من شذ عن هذا الإجماع من علماء السنة

1 Refer to *Fiqh al-Shī'ah* pg. 148

2 As an example, refer to the book written by Shaykh 'Abd al-Shakūr Fārūqī al-Lakḥnawī which is titled, *Afsānah Tahrīf al-Qur'ān*. Afsānah means: a narrative or report.

3 Sālim al-Bahansāwī in his book *Al-Sunnat al-Muftarā 'alayhā*

4 Muḥammad Mahdī al-Āṣifī, as stated by the author, who describes him as 'The truthful Imām and brother'. Al-Āṣifī is a resident of Kuwait.

The (belief that) the Qur’ān is free from any alterations is a matter in which the scholars of the Imāmī Shī’ah are unanimous and they have reached a consensus. Attention should not be paid to the one whose personal opinion opposes this consensus, just as (is done) with the one who opposes this consensus from the scholars of the (Ahl) al-Sunnah.¹

This scholar then goes on to quote some of their senior scholars who rejected this view, along with an explanation that their aḥādīth have different ratings and not all are authentic. Thus saying, he dismissed the narrations quoted in the booklet as unreliable. He says:

وقد عرفنا إجماع الطائفة واتفاقها قائم على رفض التحريف في كتاب الله، فهذه الروايات إذن مهما كثرت فهي مردودة عندنا، ولا تسئل لماذا ثبتت هذه الروايات في المجاميع عندنا، فهي مجاميع خاضعة للنقد والاجتهاد، وليست صحاحاً للأخذ والعمل

We have realised that the unanimity of the sect and their agreement regarding the rejection of the doctrine that alterations took place in the Book of Allah. These narrations, irrespective of their abundance, are rejected by us. Also, do not ask, “why are these narrations preserved in our compilations?” as these are compilations which are subject to criticism and deliberation. They are not authentic enough to be accepted and practiced upon.²

Due to the excessive rejection of this doctrine by the Shī’ah and their scholars — whether on the basis of Taqiyyah or due to this really being their belief — Dr Rushdī ‘Alayn says, “it is my view that as long as the reliable Shī’ah scholars believe that no changes, alterations, deletions and additions took place in the Book of

1 Take note of the shameless accusation against the Ahl al-Sunnah. It cannot be proven that even one of their scholars held this blasphemous view. Here, we only wish to point out this accusation. We will discuss it at length, as well as the other mistakes and contradictions of this scholar under the discussion, “present-day Shī’ah and their relationship with their predecessors,” if Allah wills.

2 Al-Āṣifi: *al-Bayān al-Tawḍīḥī Ḥawl Da’wā Taḥrīf al-Qur’ān*, which appears in the book *al-Sunnah al-Muftarā ‘alayhā*

Allah, we should be satisfied with that. There is no need to repeat some rare views and quote baseless and fabricated narrations regarding it.”¹

Shaykh Raḥmat Allah al-Hindī states in his book *Izhār al-Ḥaq*, after quoting the speech of some of their scholars who have rejected the doctrine, “hence, it has become clear that the accurate view according to the scholars of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah Imāmī sect is that the Qur’ān which Allah revealed upon His Nabī is the same as that which is between the two covers, and in the possession of the masses. There is nothing more to it than that...”²

Thus far we have observed the following; that which appears in the book of the one who claims to be a Sunnī, the former scholars — such as al-Ash‘arī — were of the view that the Shī‘ah split into two groups (the first group accepted this kufr and the second group rejected it). Thereafter, this lie was attributed to all the Rāfiḍah by al-Baghdādī and Abū Ya‘lā, Some of the latter day scholars — such as Abū al-Thanā al-Ālūsī, Dr Sālūs and others believed that the Shī‘ah were divided into two groups as far as this belief was concerned.

Dr Sālūs differentiates between them by taking their names, saying that the Uṣūlīs rejected the narrations which promote this belief, which is the demand of their methodology in ḥadīth criticism. On the other hand, the Akhbārīs accept it as they accept all narrations which are attributed to their Imāms. Then, we seen an indication towards this difference of opinion in the speech of Shaykh Raḥmat Allah.

Next, we learnt that the view of Dr Rushdī ‘Alyān was that, besides the correct view, no other view should be attributed to the Shī‘ah, as anything else is a rare or a fabricated narration. We also saw the other category of contemporaries, the likes of Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb and Iḥsān Ilāhī Ḥaḥīr among others, who believed that all the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah subscribe to this view. If any of them deny this, their denial is only on the basis of Taqiyyah, and it is not the truth.

1 *Al-‘Aql ‘ind al-Shī‘ah al-Imāmiyyah* pg. 49

2 *Izhār al-Ḥaq* pg. 77

After all of this, we decided to summon the reliable Shīʿī sources and make them speak for themselves. They should inform us of the reality of the matter. Is it so that lies and allegations have been circulating about them by some oppressors? Have some scholars attributed to them that which they do not contain? Are the statements which are recorded in the books of sects far-fetched allegations and misinterpreted implications? Are they not established, or do they have a different interpretation? It has often been said, “the quotations (reproduced by) the opposition are unreliable.”¹ Objectivity and justice are compulsory. Allah says:

وَإِذَا حَكَمْتُمْ بَيْنَ النَّاسِ أَنْ تَحْكُمُوا بِالْعَدْلِ

...and when you judge between people to judge with justice.²

وَلَا يَجْرِمَنَّكُمْ شَنَاٰنُ قَوْمٍ عَلَىٰ أَلَّا تَعْدِلُوا ۖ اِعْدِلُوا هُوَ أَقْرَبُ لِلتَّقْوَىٰ

...and do not let the hatred of a people prevent you from being just. Be just; that is nearer to righteousness.³

What Do the Shīʿī Sources Have to Say on this Subject?

Before holding the hand of the reader and bidding him farewell as he embarks on a journey, starting from the number zero of the first book written and compiled by the Shīʿah, we wish to highlight two contradictory voices. They exist and they are quite loud in almost every book of the Shīʿah in which this matter is discussed. Lending an ear to them will allow us to understand and fathom the reality of the matter in their circles. There will remain no vagueness in understanding it, even though the journey is one which includes lengthy pauses at the stations of the different Shīʿī books. The leading scholar of the Shīʿah of his time, Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (d. 381 A.H.) — the author of *Man lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh*, one of their four canonical books on ḥadīth states - :

1 Al-Qāsimī: *Tārīkh al-Jahmiyyah wa l-Muʿtazilah* pg. 22

2 Sūrah al-Nisā: 58

3 Sūrah al-Māʾidah: 8

اعتقادنا أن القرآن الذي أنزله الله تعالى على نبيه محمد وهو ما بين الدفتين وهو ما في أيدي الناس ليس بأكثر من ذلك... ومن نسب إلينا أننا نقول أكثر من ذلك فهو كاذب

Our belief is that the Qur'ān which Allah revealed upon His Nabī, Muḥammad, is that which is between the two covers and in the hands of the masses. There is nothing more to it (than that)... Whoever attributes to us (anything which indicates) that we believe in anything other than that is a liar.¹

This is the view of the one who was given the title al-Ṣadūq by them. Among his brethren from the Shī'ah are some who stand with him regarding this view.

Al-Mufīd (d. 413 A.H.) says:

إن الأخبار قد جاءت مستفيضة عن أئمة الهدى من آل محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم باختلاف القرآن وما أحدثه بعض الطاعنين فيه من الحذف والنقصان

There are innumerable narrations from the Imāms of guidance from the family of Muḥammad ﷺ regarding the differences of the Qur'ān and that which some of its critics have done, i.e. adding to it and deleting from it.²

He continues:

واتفقوا - أي الإمامية - على أن أئمة الضلال خالفوا في كثير من تأليف القرآن وعدلوا فيه عن موجب التنزيل وسنة النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم

They have agreed (the Imāmiyyah) that the Imāms of misguidance³ opposed (the truth) in a large portion of the compilation of the Qur'ān and

1 *Al-ʿIṭiqādāt* pg. 101-102

2 *Awā'il al-Maqālāt* pg. 54

3 Here, he is referring to the senior Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ — with whom Allah is pleased and they are pleased with Him. These Ṣaḥābah were led by the four khulafā', the fourth one being 'Alī

رضي الله عنه.

they turned away from the demands of that which was revealed as well as the Sunnah of Nabī ﷺ.¹

Al-Mufīd — who they refer to as *Rukn al-Islām* (the pillar of Islam), *Āyat Allāh al-Malik al-‘Allām* (the great sign of Allah, the Master, the Knowledgeable) — is also supported by some of their scholars.

These are two contradictory statements which were uttered by two of their great scholars who lived in the same era and place and who subscribed to the same belief system. In fact, al-Mufīd who is mentioned here was a student of Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī. Now, whose statement do we take? Which of the two statements is a reflection of the view of the Shī‘ah? We find that two students of al-Mufīd, who are regarded to be among the greatest scholars of the Shī‘ah, viz. al-Ṭūsī and Ibn al-Murtaḍā, hold the same view as Ibn Bābawayh, and that the research scholars of the Shī‘ah reject this blasphemous lie.

Each of these two views are supported by a group of Shī‘ah. At times, each group will claim that this is the only view held by the Shī‘ah, and the attribution of a different view to them, is a lie and an accusation. Deciphering these heaps of contradictory statements, and getting to the truth is no easy task. Reflecting over the fact that Taqiyyah is a fundamental principle of these people, to the extent that “the one who does not do Taqiyyah has no ḍīn,” we realise that the reality is hidden behind huge clouds of lies and deceptions, heaps of contradictory and conflicting statements and deep valleys of Taqiyyah and concealment.

This is why, as will be seen under the discussion of Taqiyyah, the actual position of the Shī‘ī stance is at times unclear to the Shī‘ī scholars as well. They cannot figure out which of the two statements were said as a result of Taqiyyah. Among other causes, this is why the madh-hab of the Imāms was destroyed as a result of this dilemma. Hence we will study this matter from its inception. We will attempt to distinguish the genuine statements from those which were said only on account

1 *Awā’il al-Maqālāt* pg. 13

of Taqiyyah. This will be done by analysing the statements and comparing them to that which was written by the same author elsewhere in his books. I beseech Allah to protect us from accusing others of that which that they are not guilty and may He save us from major errors in our comments and verdicts.

This pivotal discussion — which will result in expelling the Shī'ah from the ranks of the Muslims, should they be found guilty of holding the above belief as they are then guilty of opposing them in a matter in which all of them agree — will be presented in the following manner; firstly, I will trace the books which were responsible for spreading this kufr among the Shī'ah, analysing each of them.

I will pause for a moment in this study to ascertain the following; which was the first book in which this lie was recorded, who was the first person to whom this statement could be traced and the reaction of the Shī'ī scholars to these. This is an important aspect as far as studying the roots of this doctrine is concerned, and exposing the Saba'ī hands which were accomplices in this crime.

Next, we will discuss the manner in which this lie found its way into all the books of the Shī'ah. Thereafter, we will take a look at the subjects of these books and the texts therein which are related to the discussion of alterations in the Qur'ān, as well as the weight that these hold according to them. We will also shed some light on that which they refer to as *Muṣḥaf 'Alī* (a secret version of the Qur'ān which they keep among themselves).

Lastly, we will examine the rejection of this kufr by some Shī'ī scholars. Were they done merely out of Taqiyyah or was there any reality to them? All of our information will be taken directly from Shī'ī sources, except for the comments which will be added when analysing a few aspects. If you find this discussion a bit lengthy, then understand that there was no other option as this is an absolutely grave matter. Added to that, there are huge differences amongst people as to whether the Shī'ah should be regarded as kāfir or not on account of it, as you have already seen.

The Inception of this Lie — Taken Directly from the Books of the Shī'ah

The first book in which this lie was recorded was *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays*¹, which was reported from him by Abān ibn Abī 'Ayyāsh.² No other person reported this besides Abān.³ This was “the first book of the Shī'ah that came to the fore,” as stated by Ibn al-Nadīm⁴ and others. The Shī'ah have praised him abundantly, venerated him and lauded his book⁵ even though I could not find any details of

1 The books of the Shī'ah state, “*Sulaym ibn Qays* al-Hilālī whose agnomen was Abū Ṣādiq. He was one of the companions of Amīr al-Mu'minīn. He fled from Ḥajjāj who sought him and wanted to kill him. He sought protection from Abān ibn Abī 'Ayyāsh, who readily granted it to him. When he was about to die, Sulaym gave him a book, i.e. *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays*. He died in the year 90 A.H.”

Al-Barqī: *al-Rijāl* pg. 3-4, al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fahrist* pg. 111, al-Ardabīlī: *Jāmi' al-Ruwāt* 1/374, *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 167, *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 82, 83.

2 Abān ibn Abī 'Ayyāsh Fayrūz Abū Ismā'īl. Imām Aḥmad says, “his aḥādīth are discarded. People have discarded his ḥadīth a long time ago. His aḥādīth cannot be written. They are unacceptable.” Ibn Ma'in said, “his aḥādīth are nothing!” Ibn al-Madīnī said, “he was weak.” Shu'bah said, “Ibn Abī 'Ayyāsh; he would lie (when narrating) aḥādīth.” He died in the year 138 A.H. Refer to *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 1/97-101, al-Uqaylī: *al-Ḍu'a'fā* 1/38-41, Ibn Abī Ḥātim: *al-Jarḥ wa l-Ta'dīl* 2/295-296. This is only some of the comments of the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah. As for the Shī'ah scholars, Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī said, “Abān ibn Abī 'Ayyāsh is extremely weak. Our scholars have attributed the concoction of *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays* to him.” Al-Ardabīlī passed similar comments. Refer to *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 206, *Jāmi' al-Ruwāt* 1/9

3 Refer to *al-Fahrist* pg. 219, al-Khowansārī: *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 4/67, *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 83, al-Ardabīlī: *Jāmi' al-Ruwāt* 1/374, *Al-Dharī'ah* 2/152

4 *Al-Fahrist* pg. 219, *Al-Dharī'ah* 2/152

5 They report from Abū 'Abd Allah that he said regarding it, “if any of our lovers or Shī'ah does not have in his possession the book of *Sulaym ibn Qays* al-Hilālī, then he has nothing of our matters by him and he knows nothing about our causes. It is the basic source of the Shī'ah and one of the secrets of the progeny of Muḥammad ﷺ.” Foreward of *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays* pg. 4, Aghā Buzrug al-Ṭahrānī: *Al-Dharī'ah* 2/152, the footnotes of *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 2/42. Al-Nu'mānī said, “there is no difference of opinion between any of the Shī'ah who possessed knowledge and reported it from the Imāms that *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays al-Hilālī* is a primary book and one of the most important basic books of which the scholars and narrators of ḥadīth of the Ahl al-Bayt, as well as the first ones. This is because whatever is contained in this foundational book is either from Rasūlullāh ﷺ, Amīr al-Mu'minīn, al-Miqdād, Salmān al-Fārsī, Abū Dhar and those who followed their footsteps from those who saw Nabī ﷺ and Amīr al-Mu'minīn عليه السلام. He heard from both of them.

the author in all the books I referred to.¹

If there was any truth to the claims of the Shī'ah regarding him, there would have definitely been some mention of him in one of these books. However, the only books in which his name is mentioned is the books of the Shī'ah. In fact, one of the classical Shī'ī scholars stated:

إن سليمان لا يعرف ولا ذكر في خبر

Sulaym is unknown and there is no mention of him in any narration.²

However, this is not acceptable according to the latter day Shī'ah. Even though this book carries many of the most dangerous beliefs introduced by the Saba'iyyah,

continued from page 294

This (book) is among the foundational books upon which the Shī'ah rely and refer to.” Refer to al-Nu'mānī: *al-Ghaybah* pg. 61 (printed by al-A'lamī of Beirut) pg. 47 (of the Iranian print). Also refer to *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 20/210 Al-Majlisī said, “it is one of the foundational books of the Shī'ah and the first book authored in Islam.” Thereafter, al-Majlisī quotes four aḥādīth which claim that this book was read out to 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn (May Allah always expose their lies regarding him!) to which he commented, “Sulaym has spoken the truth.” *Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/156-158. Refer to *Rijāl al-Kashshī* (pg. 104-105) for the other aḥādīth quoted by us.

1 I referred to many sources of the Ahl al-Sunnah in an effort to find some details regarding him. However, nothing could be found. As an example, I could not find his name in the list of famous personalities who appear in *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* which was prepared by Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm. Similarly, his name does not appear in *Tārīkh Ibn al-Athīr*, as suggested by the lists prepared by Iḥsān 'Abbās or Sayf al-Dīn al-Kātib. *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* of Ibn al-'Imād al-Ḥanbalī, *al-Bidāyah wa l-Nihāyah* of Ibn Kathīr, *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa'd*, among other books, also do not have any mention of his name. We could not find his name in the books on narrators which include *Lisān al-Mizān*, *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*, *al-Tārīkh al-Ṣaghīr* (both of which were authored by Imām Al-Bukhārī), *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* of al-Mizzī, etc. This makes no sense at all as he was, “the first author of Islam,” and he was also, “being chased by Ḥajjāj, who wanted to kill him.” An individual who stood out to this extent in these two fields simply cannot be neglected or forgotten. Thus, his non-appearance is a clear proof that the Shī'ī statements are empty claims. He is nothing more than an imaginary personality.

2 *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 83

such as taking ‘Alī عليه السلام as a deity and describing him using words which are only used to describe the Rabb of the universe¹, the Shī‘ah did not hesitate and they were not deterred by this from praising him excessively and blindly accepting all that he claims to narrate from the Ahl al-Bayt. The statements uttered by some of their ‘greatest’ scholars in his favour leaves us bewildered. They go on to claim that he was a brick in the foundation of the family of Muḥammad صلى الله عليه وسلم and a secret from their secrets.

All of this is despite the fact that the chain as well as the texts of his narrations announces their falseness. They are from the narrations of Abān, whose narrations are discarded or valueless according to the Ahl al-Sunnah, and he is considered a weak narrator according to the Shī‘ī books on narrators. Sulaym, who is the supposed author of the book cannot be traced. Perhaps his existence was restricted to the imaginations of the Shī‘ah.

The style of the book itself is quite contradictory and confusing. However, this is the explanation that they offer regarding it:

ما يتراءى من الاضطراب في الطريق غير قادح وهو واقع في أكثر طرق كتب أصحابنا

1 Some of the narrations of the book plead to ‘Alī عليه السلام by calling him the following names; “Yā Awwal (the one who’s existence preceded everything else), Yā Ākhir (the one who’s existence succeeded everything else), Yā Zāhir (the one who is above everything) Yā Bāṭin (the one who is beneath everything), O the one who has complete knowledge regarding everything!’. It is even claimed herein that this description was said by the Sun, when it called out to ‘Alī عليه السلام and it was heard by Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār رضي الله عنهم, who passed out upon hearing it and recovered after a while. *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays* pg 38 (printed by al-A‘lamī) and pg. 31-32 (of the Najaf print). These qualities (i.e. attributing them to ‘Alī عليه السلام) are from the evil effects of the Saba’iyyah who take ‘Alī عليه السلام as a deity. Unfortunately, the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah have inherited it from them. After preserving this drivel in their books, they shamelessly attributed it to the Ahl al-Bayt. Thus, they have wrapped up the Ahl al-Bayt, who they claim to support, in this dirt! These attributes are undoubtedly confined to Allah. He says:

هُوَ الْأَوَّلُ وَالْآخِرُ وَالظَّاهِرُ وَالْبَاطِنُ وَهُوَ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ عَلِيمٌ

He is the First and the Last, the Ascendant and the Intimate, and He is, of all things, Knowing.
(Sūrah al-Ḥadīd: 3)

The confusion that can be noticed in the methodology is not (a reason) to discredit it. This is the condition of most of the books of our scholars.¹

Many of the texts in this book are clearly from the books of the sacrilegious Bāṭiniyyah. Despite this, the authors of the four reliable books (according to them) as well as others among their scholars² have quoted from it, without any reservations. This book contains many of the beliefs of the extremist Shī'ah. Surprisingly, this book has already been exposed by some Shī'ī scholars!

The question is; what drove them — against their practice — to speak the truth? What about this book did they find so intolerable that they felt compelled to expose its reality? Was it the fact that 'Alī عليه السلام is portrayed as a deity? Was it on account of the attempted insults against the Qur'ān or any other Islamic beliefs? Definitely not! The only danger that they found in this book was that it stated the number of Imams to be thirteen. This is calamity like no other, as it demolishes the very foundation of the religion of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah, especially since this is stated in a book which is considered to be the basic books of Shī'ism and it was “the first book authored in Islam”.

Hence, they did us a huge favour and saved us the time required to analyse this book. A group of them declared:

ان الكتاب موضوع لا مزية فيه

This book is definitely a fabrication. There is no room for doubt regarding that.³

1 Al-Khowansārī: *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 4/68

2 Al-Kulaynī relies upon it and he dedicated a few chapters to it, as examples; Chapter: That which has been narrated regarding the twelve. *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/525, Chapter: The pillars of Kufr *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/391, etc. Similar to him was Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, who was given the title by them of al-Ṣadūq, in his book *Man lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh*. *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 4/68, *Al-Dharī'ah* 2/154. *al-Iḥtijāj* of al-Ṭabarsī, *al-Ikhtiṣāṣ* of al-Mufīd, *Tafsīr al-Furāt*, etc., are other examples wherein this could be seen. Refer to the forward of the *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays* pg. 6.

3 Refer to *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 83, Ibn Dāwūd: *al-Rijāl* pg. 413, 414

They have explained the flaws in this book and pointed out the signs which indicate that it was concocted. One such indication, as they have pointed out, is that it is inconsistent with history. Example:

إن محمد بن أبي بكر وعظ أباه عند الموت لأنه غضب الإمامة من علي“ مع أن محمد بن أبي بكر ولد في سنة حجة الوداع فكيف يعظ أباه وعمره ثلاث سنوات

Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr admonished his father at the time of his demise, as he had snatched the mantle of Imāmah from ‘Alī.

(The author states this) whereas Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr was only born during the year of Ḥajjat al-Wadā‘. Thus, how is it possible that he admonished his father whilst he was only three years old?¹

Similarly, he stated that there are thirteen Imāms. Therefore, they admitted that Sulaym is unknown, there is no mention of his name in the narrations and the chains of the book are all different and beyond comprehension.² Abān ibn Abī ‘Ayyāsh is the agreed upon suspect behind this fabrication.³ One of their contemporary scholars managed to guess the era in which it was concocted. He says:

إنه موضوع في آخر الدولة الأموية لغرض صحيح

It was fabricated towards the end of the Umayyad dynasty for a valid reason.⁴

However, he presented no proof for this claim of his. A group from amongst them — apparently — were not ready to part ways with this book, as it is one of their

1 Al-Khowansārī: *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 4/67, *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 83

2 Refer to *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 206, Al-Khowansārī: *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 4/67, Ibn Dāwūd: *al-Rijāl* pg. 413-414

3 *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 206, Ibn Dāwūd: *al-Rijāl* pg. 413-414

4 Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sha‘rānī in his footnotes on *al-Kāfī* which is printed with the commentary of *al-Māzindarānī* 2/373-374.

foundational books and the primary source for their scholars. Thus they said:

والوجه عندي الحكم بتعديل المشار إليه والتوقف في الفاسد من كتابه

My opinion is that the (correct) approach is to venerate the one who is being pointed to and not accept the corrupt (views mentioned) in his book.¹

This is despite the fact that this ‘corrupt view’ destroys the foundations of Shī‘ism, as it states that there are thirteen Imāms. However, this view did not receive a warm welcome in Shī‘ī circles. Thus, some decided to take action against it in a way that uproots the problem which puts their foundations at stake. Hence, they decided to straighten out the book so that it may be consistent with Shī‘ī logic. Al-Khowansārī indicates to some ‘alterations’ made to the book. He says:

إن ما وصل إلينا من نسخ الكتاب هو أن عبد الله بن عمر وعظ أباه عند الموت

The copies of the book which reached us (state) that ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Umar admonished his father at the time of death.²

Al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī says:

والذي وصل إلينا من نسخه ليس فيه شيء فاسد، ولا شيء مما استدل به على الوضع

There is nothing corrupt in the copies which have reached us and there is nothing in there which indicates that (it is a) fabrication.³

I searched for the errors of the book, as mentioned by the first group, in two different prints thereof⁴, but I could not find them. This informs us that they

1 *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 83, *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 20/210

2 *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 4/69

3 *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 20/210

4 Printed in Najaf by al-Maṭba‘ah al-Ḥaydariyyah and by al-‘Ālamī in Beirut.

change their books, add on to them and delete passages from them. Nevertheless, this book is regarded as a reliable source by latter day Shī'ah, as established by al-Majlisī in *Al-Biḥār*¹, al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī in *al-Wasā'il*² as well as others.

I believe that this deliberation regarding the book *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays* is necessary in order to expose the role of the Saba'iyyah, who are the criminals behind this lie. We have already observed that this lie started from the book *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays*, regarding which it is said that Abān fabricated it, and one of them even specified the date of its occurrence, i.e. the end of the Umayyad dynasty. We have also mentioned that al-Milṭī suspects Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam.

The crux of the matter is that this lie was only brought into existence in the second century. I have searched through the views attributed to Ibn Saba and the Sab'iyyah. I did not find this view being reported from Ibn Saba. It seems as if this idea did not even cross his mind as its falsity was all too apparent to the generation of his era, who had witnessed the revelation. It would have been suicidal to his mission if even hinted in that direction, thus he did not dare to spread this lie.

However, being the scum that he was, instead of claiming that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ altered the Qur'ān, he expressed his idea in the following words:

بأن هذا القرآن جزء من تسعة أجزاء وعلمه عند علي

This Qur'ān is one of nine portions and the knowledge thereof is possessed by 'Alī.³

His statement is vague. The exact meaning that was intended cannot be determined. However, the treatise of Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ (d. 95 A.H.) clarifies its meaning:

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/32

2 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 20/210

3 *Al-Jowzajānī: Aḥwāl al-Rijāl* pg. 38

ومن خصومه هذه السبئية التي أدركنا يقولوا (كذا) هدينا لوهي ضل عنه الناس وعلم خفي ويزعمون أن نبي الله كتم تسعة أعشار القرآن، ولو كان نبي الله كاتماً شيئاً مما أنزل الله لكتم شأن امرأة زيد { وَإِذْ تَقُولُ لِلَّذِي أَنْعَمَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَأَنْعَمْتَ عَلَيْهِ أَمْسِكْ عَلَيْكَ زَوْجَكَ وَاتَّقِ اللَّهَ وَتُخْفِي فِي نَفْسِكَ مَا اللَّهُ مُبْدِيهِ وَتَخْشَى النَّاسَ ۗ وَاللَّهُ أَحَقُّ أَنْ تَخْشَاهُ }

Among his opponents were these Saba'iyyah, who we have met. They say, "we have found revelation that was lost to the people and knowledge that was secret." They assert that the Nabī of Allah hid away nine tenths of the Qur'ān. If Nabī ﷺ wished to hide way any of that which Allah revealed, he would have hid away the matter of the wife of Zayd, "and [remember, O Muḥammad], when you said to the one on whom Allah bestowed favour and you bestowed favour, "keep your wife and fear Allah," while you concealed within yourself that which Allah is to disclose. And you feared the people, while Allah has more right that you fear Him."^{1,2}

This informs us that the Saba'iyyah did not hold this view. Rather, it was only introduced later. As for the one who was guilty of playing the greatest role in spreading this among the Shī'ah, it will not be easy to give a definite answer or name specific persons. It will serve no point to study all the chains of the narrations (of the Shī'ah) regarding the subject of interpolation in the Qur'ān as there are narrations which do not even have chains, such as the narrations of *al-Iḥtijāj* by al-Ṭabarṣī. Added to that, there are many indications that chains were only introduced by them after the passing of a few eras, as will appear. Another reason why this will be a frivolous exercise is that one of their tactics is to attach authentic chains to fabrications. Therefore, studying the chains, in this case, will not lead us to a decisive conclusion.

The Spread of this Lie in the Book of the Shī'ah

We have seen, if we take their word that this lie started with the book of *Sulaym ibn Qays*. Initially, there were only two narrations regarding it, and it was not

1 Sūrah a-Aḥzāb: 37

2 *Kitāb al-Īmān of Muḥammad ibn Abī 'Umar al-Makkī al-'Adnī* pg. 249-250 (of the manuscript).

as clear as that which we learnt from those after him. You will understand this from the narrations which we will present after presenting all the narrations regarding the subject of interpolation. It seems as if the matter was still in its early stages when he penned it down in his book and the lies in support of it were minimal. It was also a matter that was rejected by some of the Shī'ah. Thus, it was on the verge of dying out. Unfortunately, the third century was ill-fated with the appearance of a man who held onto this fabrication, added on to it and strengthened its pillars which were about to collapse.

Their scholar, 'Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, who was the mentor of the author of *al-Kāfī* — al-Kulaynī — filled his *Tafsīr* with this lie¹, which he also mentioned in the preface of his book.² This is why their scholar, al-Kāshānī said:

فإن تفسيره مملوء منه وله غلو فيه

His *Tafsīr* is filled with it (examples of interpolation) and he adopted extremism in that matter.³

Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī says:

وقد صرح بهذا المعتقد في أول تفسيره وملا كتابه من أخباره مع التزامه في أوله ألا يذكر فيه إلا مشايخه وثقاته

He (al-Qummī) clearly stated this belief in the beginning of his *Tafsīr* and he filled it with these narrations. He also took it upon himself in the beginning of his book to mention (narrate from) only his teachers and those who he relies upon.⁴

1 There are many examples of this in his book. The following are only a few; *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/48, 100, 110, 118, 122, 123, 142, 159, 2/21, 111, 125 etc. Some of them will be quoted later.

2 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/10

3 *Tafsīr al-ṣāfi* 1/52

4 Al-Ṭabarsī: *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 13 of the manuscript and pg. 26 of the printed version.

Despite this book (*Tafsīr al-Qummī*) being filled with this blasphemy, one of the leading Shīʿī scholars — al-Khūʿī — declares all of al-Qummī's narrations reliable, as mentioned previously.¹ After al-Qummī, his student al-Kulaynī (d. 328 or 329 A.H) — who is given the title *Thiqat al-Islam* by the Shīʿah and he is the author of one of their four seminal and most reliable works — quoted many of these narrations² in his book *al-Kāfī*, even after he took it upon himself to only quote authentic narrations.³

It is for this reason that those who wrote regarding him from the Shīʿah have stated:

أنه كان يعتقد التحريف والنقصان في القرآن، لأنه روى روايات في هذا المعنى في كتابه الكافي ولم يتعرض لقدح فيها مع أنه ذكر في أول كتابه أنه يثق بما رواه

He believed that alterations and deletions took place in the Qurʾān. This (is established from the fact that) he quoted narrations of this meaning in his book *al-Kāfī* without criticising them. This is despite the fact that he mentioned in the start of his book he relies upon all that he narrates.⁴

According to the scholars of the Rāfiḍah, *al-Kāfī* is of the highest standards of authenticity, as al-Kulaynī was a contemporary of the four messengers who are believed (by them) to have had contact with their hidden and awaited Mahdī. It was extremely easy for him to verify the authenticity of his compilations as he lived with them in the same city, i.e. Baghdad.⁵ It should also be noted that

1 Refer to the introduction of this book or *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* 1/63 of al-Khūʿī for his exact statement.

2 Refer to *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* (vol.1 Bāb fihī Nukat wa Nutaf min al-Tanzīl fi l-Wilāyah pg. 413). The numbers of these narrations are as follows; 8, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 45, 47, 58, 59, 60, 64. Refer to vol. 2 of *al-Kāfī*, Bāb al-nawādir pg. 627 onwards, numbers 2, 3, 4, 23, 28. These narrations unambiguously state this. It is quite a stretch to claim that they are narrations of variations in recitation.

3 Refer to the introduction of *al-Kāfī* pg. 9, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi*, the sixth introduction, pg. 52 (printed by al-Aʿlamī in Beirut) and pg. 14 (of the Tehrani print by al-Maktabah al-Islāmiyyah)

4 Al-Kāshānī: *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi*, the sixth introduction pg. 52 of the Aʿlamī print and pg. 14 of the Tehran print.

5 Refer to Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-Ḥāʾirī: *Minhāj ʿAmalī lī al-Taqrīb* which is printed along with the book *al-Waḥdat al-Islāmiyyah* pg. 233. Their older scholars held the same view. Refer to Ibn Ṭāwūs: *Kashf al-Maḥajjah* pg. 159. Also refer to the introduction of this book.

Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī declared all the narrations regarding the subject of alterations in the Qur’ān as fabrications even though they appear in *al-Kāfi* — which they have described in this manner and they have declared reliable.

I referred to *Mir’āt al-‘Uqūl* of al-Majlisī, where I found that he declared some of the narrations of *al-Kāfi* as weak. However, he declared the narrations which stated that alterations took place to be authentic.¹ The same was seen in the book *al-Shāfi* (the commentary of *al-Kāfi*).² Recently, a book by the name of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfi*³ was printed. After referring to it, I found that the author removed all the narrations which interfere with the Book of Allah. In fact, he discarded entire chapters regarding it, along with their narrations⁴, just as he deleted many chapters which contained many beliefs which make the Shī’ah targets of criticism.⁵ We cannot be sure as to whether this was done out of honesty or was it just Taqiyyah, especially

1 Example, he authenticated the narration:

أَنَّ الْقُرْآنَ الَّذِي جَاءَ بِهِ جِبْرَائِيلُ - عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ - إِلَى مُحَمَّدٍ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ وَآلِهِ وَسَلَّمَ سَبْعَةَ عَشَرَ أَلْفَ آيَةٍ

The Qur’ān which was brought by Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ to Muḥammad ﷺ was seventeen thousand verses.

The verses of the Qur’ān do not exceed six thousand. Refer to *Mir’āt al-‘Uqūl* 2/536

2 Refer to *al-Shāfi Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 7/227 to see his authentication of the narration quoted in the previous footnote.

3 Printed in the year 1401 A.H. by one of their contemporary scholars, Muḥammad al-Bāqir al-Bahūdī. It comprises of three volumes.

4 Such as the chapter; the Qur’ān was not gathered in totality by anyone except the Imāms. It is from the explicit chapter headings regarding this lie. Refer to *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 26-27. He deleted other chapters as well, just as he deleted the narrations of Bāb fihī Nukāt wa nutaf min al-tanzīl fī al-Wilāyah. Initially it contained 92 narrations, but they were brought down to two by him. They now contain no criticism of the text of the Qur’ān, but they still misinterpret the meanings thereof according to the methodology of the Bāṭiniyyah. This chapter contained the majority of the narrations of *al-Kāfi* on the subject of alterations. This is why the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* believed that it was confined to it. Refer to page 36 of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*.

5 Like the chapters “when the Imāms feel like practising then they practice, the Imāms know their time of death and they do not die except by choice, the Imāms have knowledge of the past and the future and nothing remains hidden from them,” etc. Compare Kitāb al-Ḥujjah of *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* to Kitāb al-Ḥujjah of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfi* to get clear understanding of the matter.

since many of the aḥādīth discarded by him were authenticated by al-Majlisī in *Mir'āt al-'Uqūl* and the author of *al-Shāfi*.

Further, this lie found its place in many pages across *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī* which was authored by Al-'Ayyāshī — who is of the same rank as al-Kulaynī.¹ This is also one of their reliable books, as mentioned previously² (even though its narrations have no chains to them). The author of *Al-Biḥār* claims that the chains were left out by one of the scribes.³ Furāt ibn Ibrāhīm al-Kūfī, who lived in the third century, authored his own Tafsīr, which was named *Tafsīr Furāt*.⁴ He was also quite comfortable with lending space to the narrations which promote this lie⁵ in his book. This book is also a reliable book according to them.⁶ His contemporary, Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Nu'mānī,⁷ narrated many of these narrations⁸ in his book *al-Ghaybah*, which one of their best and most reliable books.⁹ Another bigot who belonged to this clique which was found at that time was Abū al-Qāsim al-Kūfī. Some of the books of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah have declared him an extremist.¹⁰

1 Regarding this, refer to the following pages (including others): 1/13, 168, 169, 206, etc.

2 Refer to the introduction of this book.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/28

4 Printed by al-Maṭba'ah al-Ḥaydariyyah of Najaf. The front page states, 'The valuable Tafsīr which the souls of the scholars were longing to see. Despite its small size, it contains that which the larger commentaries do not contain. It is totally in accordance to the aḥādīth and narrations of Nabī ﷺ and the Imams ﷺ.'

5 Refer to *Tafsīr Furāt* pg. 18, 85, etc.

6 Refer to the introduction of this book.

7 They assert that he was a contemporary of the four messengers of their awaited and hidden Mahdī. He was from the students of their scholar al-Kulaynī, the author of *al-Kāfi*. Perhaps he learnt this kufr from him. They even say that he is the one who wrote *al-Kāfi* and assisted al-Kulaynī in authoring it. Refer to *Rijāl al-Najāshī* pg. 297, *Amal al-Āmāl* pg. 232, *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 162

8 Refer to page 218 of *al-Ghaybah*

9 Refer to *Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/30

10 Al-Najāshī says, "Alī ibn Aḥmad Abū al-Qāsim al-Kūfī was a man from the people of Kūfah. He would claim that he is from the family of Abū Ṭālib and he adopted extremism towards the end and his religion was corrupted. He authored many books, most of them are (filled with) corrupted (content); *Kitāb al-Ambiyā'*, *Kitāb al-Awṣiyā'*, *Kitāb al-Bida' al-Muḥdathah*, *Kitāb al-Tabdīl wa al-Tahrīf*." Al-Najāshī also mentions that the extremists claim that he reached extremely high stages. He died in the year 233 A.H. *Rijāl al-Najāshī* pg. 203, *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 233. The contemporary Rāfiqī who wrote the forward to the book *al-Istighāthah* (who did not clearly state his name) tried to dispel from him the stigma of being an extremist. Refer to the forward.

He exposed himself in the book *al-Istighātha*, stating that he adhered to this misguided methodology.¹ Al-Najāshī attributed to him a book named *al-Tabdīl wa al-Taḥrīf*.² However, this book along with its likes is no longer available, as pointed out by the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*.³ Herein, he reports directly from al-Qummī⁴ some narrations which state that alterations took place. It is perhaps from him that he learnt this kufr.

Succeeding the above mentioned bigots, we see their scholar al-Mufīd (d. 413 A.H.) writing in his book *Awā'il al-Maqālāt* that his sect have reached a consensus regarding this lie⁵, and he quotes some of his narrations in some of his books such as *Al-Irshād*⁶ — which is considered one of their reliable books⁷ The stench of all the above-listed book as well as others leaves a Muslim doubtless that they are from the plotting of malicious enemy of the Book of Allah, His religion and the follower thereof.

This sect was forced to resort to this — as will appear under the analyses of the texts of this lie and its narrations — on account of the fact that the Book of Allah was empty and pure of the bizarre promoted by them, as well as all their other views which cannot be traced back to the Qur'ān. It was far beyond their capacity to take any steps by which they could have altered any of the verses of the Qur'ān, as they had done to the pure Sunnah by adding some narrations which were exposed by the experts of the science.

Since they were unable to add on to the Book of Allah, as it was beyond their reach, they decided to claim that the Book of Allah was altered and portions of it

1 *Al-Istighāthah* or *al-Bida' al-Muḥdathah* pg. 25

2 *Rijāl al-Najāshī* pg. 203

3 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 30-31

4 *Al-Istighāthah* pg. 29

5 *Awā'il al-Maqālāt* pg. 51

6 *Al-Irshād* pg. 365

7 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/27

were deleted. Shouting out a claim is no difficult task, especially for the one who is an oppressive bigot. This plot, apparently, was resorted to as a tactic to soothe their followers, who might have protested upon being unable to find any mention of their Imāms or beliefs in the Book of Allah, the lofty positions of which they kept hearing from their leaders.¹

Thus, they found this lie to be an emergency exit, due to which their scholars of the third and fourth centuries raised through the ranks by discussing this. However, poor planning on their part, as it seems, as far as this problem was concerned landed them into the deepest trouble. It utterly disgraced them in front of everyone and it snipped the veil that kept their faces covered, revealing their hypocrisy and enmity. It expelled them from the domain of Islam, attachment to the Qur'ān and love for the Ahl al-Bayt!

This is why their leading scholar of the fourth century, Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī — the author of *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* (one of their four canonical books of ḥadīth) and the one who they refer to as Ra'īs al-Muḥaddithīn (the leader of the ḥadīth scholars) (d. 381 A.H.) — announced that the Shī'ah are innocent of this belief.² Similarly, al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (d. 436 A.H.) would reject this belief and he would even declare those who subscribe to this belief as kāfir, as mentioned by Ibn Ḥazm.³ His rejection was even noted by al-Ṭūsī⁴ and al-Ṭabarsī.⁵

Al-Ṭūsī, who authored two of their four reliable ḥadīth books and two of their reliable books on narrators,⁶ also expressed his reservations regarding this belief and its relationship with the Shī'ah. The same was done by al-Ṭabarsī⁷, the author

1 The explanation of this will appear under the discussion of Imāmah and their other beliefs.

2 Refer to his book *Al-I'tiqādāt* pg. 101-102. The exact words will appear later.

3 *Al-Fiṣal* 5/22

4 *Al-Tibyān* 1/3

5 *Majma' al-Bayān* 1/31

6 *Al-Tibyān* 1/3

7 *Majma' al-Bayān* 1/31

of *Majma' al-Bayān*. We will quote — if Allah wills — their exact words regarding this, along with a comparative study of their statements in their other books. The statements of the Shī'ah regarding their rejection will also be quoted.

Despite this rejection and denunciation of these beliefs by these leading 'scholars' the matter was not brought to an end. In the sixth century, al-Ṭabarsī, the author of *al-Ihtijāj* made it his responsibility to revive this kufr. Hence, he filled his book with it.¹ However, none of his narrations were accompanied by chains. He claims — in the introduction of his book — that he did not mention most of the chains as they are famous or agreed upon by his sect. He says:

ولا تأتي في أكثر ما نوره من الأخبار بإسناد، إما لوجود الإجماع عليه، أو موافقته لما دلت العقول إليه،
أو لأشتهاره في السير والكتب بين المخالف والمؤلف

We will not mention the chains of most of the narrations which we will quote, either due to there being consensus regarding them, their compliance to logic or on account of them being well known in the books of siyar (the books on campaigns) by both, the opposition as well as those who agree.²

This Ṭabarsī, who openly declared his kufr, was among the contemporaries of Abū al-Faḍl al-Ṭabarsī, the author of *Majma' al-Bayān*, who denied this belief and declared the Shī'ah innocent regarding it.³ It seems as if there was a story behind the rejection of these four individuals, or the matter became a secret. Thus, we

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* script 32 of the manuscript.

2 *al-Ihtijāj* pg. 14

3 Some writers mistook one for the other. Subsequently, they ascribed the book *al-Ihtijāj* to the author of *Majma' al-Bayān*. The author of *al-Ihtijāj* openly pronounces this kufr whereas the author of *Majma' al-Bayān* declares his innocence therefrom. Among those who committed this mistake was Nābilah 'Ubayd in her book *Nash'at al-Shī'ah* (pg. 39-40), even though she was a Shī'ī. Similarly some authors could not differentiate between the Ṭabarsī who authored *Majma' al-Bayān* and the Ṭabarsī who authored *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*. They mistook both to be the same person, whereas there was a gap of six generations between them. 'Abd al-Muta'āl al-Jabrī is among those who committed this error in his book *Hīwār Ma'ā al-Shī'ah* pg. 187

did not see a considerable effort being made to raise it or spread it — openly and on a large scale — except during the Safavid dynasty, wherein it was witnessed that the efforts behind the revival of this belief, concoctions to support it, etc., were even more than that which took place in the third century.

This ‘duty’ was taken up by a group of Shīʿī scholars appointed by the Safavids. Thus, they made such an effort to revive this kufr that this lie, which started off as merely two narrations in the book *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays* multiplied until they are now — as admitted by Niʿmat Allah al-Jazāʾirī — more than two thousand narrations. This was a result of the effort of the scholars of the Safavid dynasty (in which Taqiyyah was abandoned to some extent), who left no stone unturned in spreading this kufr in their books. These include al-Majlisī in his *Biḥār*¹, al-Kāshānī in *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi*², al-Baḥrānī in *al-Burhān*³, Niʿmat Allah al-Jazāʾirī in *Al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah*⁴ and other books, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sharīf in *Mirʾāt al-Anwār*⁵, al-Māzindarānī⁶ (the commentator on *al-Kāfi*) as well as others.

Towards the end of the thirteenth century the Shīʿah were completely undressed and disgraced (regarding this subject) by their scholar Ḥusayn al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, who was greatly honoured by them.⁷ He compiled a book regarding this kufr in

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār*, Kitāb al-Qurʾān, Bāb taʿlīf al-Qurʾān wa annahū ʿalā ghayr mā anzala Allah ʿazz wa jall 92/66.

2 *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi*, the sixth introduction pg. 40-55, 136, 163, 399, 420.

3 *Al-Burhān* (in many places). As examples; vol. 1 pg. 15 Bāb an al-Qurʾān lam yajmaʿ hū kamā unzil illā al-Aʿimmah, pg. 34, 70, 102, 140, 170, 277, 294-295, 308, etc.

4 *Al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah* 2/357-358

5 The second introduction, *Mirʾāt al-Anwār* of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sharīf pg. 36-49.

6 He explained *al-Kāfi* and he agreed with the drivel puked out by the author, to the extent that he said, “deletions from the Qurʾān and alterations to it is established by our narrators with tawātur (as far as the meaning is concerned).” Refer to *Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ al-Kāfi* 11/76. It is worth noting at this juncture that this ‘tawātur’ is what the other scholars of the Shīʿah consider as an obvious lie.

7 He is well-respected by the Shīʿah, to the extent that they have taken one of his books, *Mustadrak al-Wasāʾil*, as one of their reliable sources on ḥadīth, as will be explained under the discussion of their beliefs regarding the Sunnah. Upon the expiry of this Ṭabarsī, they buried him in the most blessed land, according to them, “between the family and the book”, i.e. in the third chamber to the right of the ‘blessed courtyard’ from the door of the Qiblah in Najaf. Refer to Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭehrānī: *Aʿlām al-Shīʿah*, category two of volume one pg. 553.

which he gathered all their concoctions on this subject in one book, which he named *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb fī Ithbāt Tahriṭ Kitāb Rabb al-Arbāb*¹ (the definitive conclusion in proving the distortion of the Book of the absolute Lord of lords).

This book will always be a source of disgrace to the Shī'ah, as the author gathered all the narrations (which were spread out) regarding it, the statements of their scholars who authenticated these narrations as well as the statements of their research scholars who accepted this kufr. He penned down this book in an effort to counter a group of the Shī'ah who could not digest this kufr and refused to accept this lie. This is clearly understood in his rebuttal of them at the end his book.²

This book brought out that which was hidden and made clear that which was vague. He revealed the malicious plots and enmity for the Qur'ān and its followers by the Shī'ah, which were kept hidden in the 'secret passages' of their books. In the introduction to his book, this sacrilegious individual reveals the motive behind his attack on the Book of Allah:

فيقول العبد المذنب المسيء حسين بن محمد تقي الدين الطبرسي جعله الله من الواقفين ببابه المتمسكين بكتابه (!): هذا كتاب لطيف وسفر شريف عملته في إثبات تحريف القرآن وفضائح أهل الجور والعدوان، وسميته فصل الخطاب في تحريف كتاب رب الأرباب... وأودعت فيه من بدائع الحكمة ما تقر به كل عين، وأرجو ممن ينتظر رحمته المسيئون أن ينفعني به في يوم لا ينفع مال ولا بنون

The sinful evil doing slave Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad Taqī al-Dīn al-Ṭabarsī (may Allah make him among those who stand at his door and hold onto his book (sic!)), "this is a small book and a noble scroll which I have written to prove that alterations took place in the Qur'ān and the embarrassing (crimes) of the oppressors and enemies. I have named it *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb fī Ithbāt Tahriṭ Kitāb Rabb al-Arbāb*... I have placed in it amazing points of

1 He committed the crime of authoring this book in the year 1292 A.H., and it was printed in Iran in the year 1298 A.H. I have in my possession both; a copy of the manuscript as well as the printed copy. Further details will appear regarding it in the fourth chapter, if Allah wills.

2 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 360

wisdom which will please every eye. I hope from the one whose mercy is anticipated by the sinners that he grants me the benefits of it on the day that neither wealth nor (ones) offspring will be of any benefit.¹

Look at how the Zoroastrians, hide their evil agenda behind ostentation and lies to fool the simple minded and ignorant folk. One of them, whilst trying to hide the filthy agenda (of the author) says:

قد يقال: إن نظره في تأليف ذلك الكتاب إلى جمع تلك الأخبار والشواذ والنوادر ولم يكن غرضه اعتقاد التحريف

It is said: his idea behind writing that book was to gather all those narrations and strange and rare (statements). His motive was not to (establish) the belief that alterations took place.²

However, this claim is belied by the very title of the book. It was a waste of ink and paper, and it was undoubtedly Taqiyyah.³ Some of the contemporary Shīʿī scholars have denounced this belief, even though their cover was blown away by the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*. Among them are al-Balāghī, who done so in *Ālā al-Raḥmān*⁴, Muḥsin al-Amīn in *al-Shīʿah Bayn al-Ḥaqāʾiq wa l-Awhām*⁵, ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn Sharaf al-Dīn in *Ajwibat Masā’il Jār Allah*⁶, al-Khuṭī in his *Tafsīr al-Bayān*⁷, Muḥammad Jawād Mughniyah in *al-Shīʿah fī al-Mizān*⁸, as well as other books of his, Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā in *Al-Shīʿah wa Uṣūluhā*⁹ as well as

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 2

2 Muḥammad al-Ṭabaṭabāʾī: footnotes of *Al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah* 2/364

3 An analysis of his book, debunking of his arguments and exposure of his lies will appear under the chapter regarding present day Shīʿah.

4 *Ālā al-Raḥmān*: 1/17-32

5 *Al-Shīʿah Bayn al-Ḥaqāʾiq wa l-Awhām* pg. 160

6 *Ajwibat Masā’il Jār Allah* pg. 27-37

7 *Al-Bayān* pg. 226

8 *Al-Shīʿah fī al-Mizān*: pg. 58

9 *Aṣl al-Shīʿah wa Uṣūluhā* pg. 88

others. We will pause along the course of our journey to analyse their statements, under the chapter regarding present day Shī'ah and their relationship with their predecessors.

Now, which course should we take? Do we go with that which Imām al-Ash'arī stated in *al-Maḳālāt* (that the Shī'ah have more than one view on this subject and they did not agree upon this deviation)? Should we accept that there are two groups among the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah; one has adopted extremism and the other accepts the truth, as stated by some who claim to be from the Ahl al-Sunnah (as quoted above) as well as some writers of the Shī'ah? Or, should we accept the view that the Shī'ah (who accepted the truth only done so due to) Taḳiyyah, as stated by some of the Ahl al-Sunnah as well as those who accept the belief that interpolation took place from among the Shī'ah, such as Ni'mat Allah al-Jazāi'rī²? All of this will be looked at and explained in the next discussion.

The Contents of the Narrations on Alterations in the Book of the Shī'ah

After presenting the names of the books in which this deception appears, we now move on to some of the contents of the narrations, the birth of this lie, the manner in which it spread and what was the final result. We will start with the first book of the Shī'ah which contained this lie, i.e. *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays*. We find this mentioned in the beginning of this book. It appears as part of two lengthy narrations which are related to the subject of Imāmah of 'Alī عليه السلام. The first narration is reported by Abān ibn 'Ayyāsh (regarding whom it is agreed that he is unreliable — as explained) from *Sulaym ibn Qays*. Part of it states:

أَنْ عَلِيًّا لَزِمَ بَيْتَهُ حَتَّى جَمَعَهُ وَكَانَ فِي الصُّحُفِ وَالرِّقَاعِ

'Alī remained in his house until he gathered it all, as it was in booklets and patches (of leather).³

1 *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/52-53, *Qawāmi' al-Fuḍūl* pg. 298

2 *Al-Anwār al-Nu'māniyyah* 2/358-359. His exact words will appear shortly, if Allah wills.

3 *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays* pg. 81

He explained his delay in pledging allegiance to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be a result of his engrossment with compiling the Qur’ān. He said, when Abū Bakr sent for him to come forward and pledge his allegiance:

إني آليت على نفسي يميناً ألا أرتدي رداءً إلا للصلاة حتى أولف القرآن وأجمعه

I have promised myself not to wear an upper garment, except for ṣalāh, until I compile and gather the Qur’ān.¹

Claims similar to this one have appeared in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. However, they could not be established with sound chains of narration. This is why Ibn Ḥajar said:

The chain of the narration from ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that he said, “I have promised myself not to wear my upper garment, except for ṣalāh, until I compile the Qur’ān,” after which he compiled it is unreliable due to one of the narrators being left out. If we accept that it is authentic, then it means that he gathered it in his chest (memorised it). That which appears in some narrations — that he gathered it between the two covers — is a mistake of the narrator.²

1 *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays* pg. 81. Take note that in this narration ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not offer any other explanation regarding the delay of his pledge to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, except his pre-occupation with the compilation of the Qur’ān. It is as if the one who fabricated this tale momentarily forgot their very basis, i.e. Imāmah and that ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not pledge his allegiance due to him believing that he was the appointed Waṣī (as they claim). This is an oft-repeated mistake that occurs in many of the matter which they wish to establish. They keep establishing one belief using a concoction in which they unintentionally destroy another of their beliefs. This is not surprising, as it is the outcome and outstanding trait of lies; they keep contradicting one another irreconcilably. Allah says:

وَلَوْ كَانَ مِنْ عِنْدِ غَيْرِ اللَّهِ لَوَجَدُوا فِيهِ اخْتِلَافًا كَثِيرًا

If it had been from [any] other than Allah, they would have found within it much contradiction.
(Sūrah al-Nisā: 82)

This verse proves that if anything is falsely claimed to be from Allah, it will most definitely contain irreconcilable contradictions.

2 *Fath al-Bārī* 9/12-13. Refer to *Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif* of Abū Dāwūd as well, pg. 16

The more authentic version, which is the one which is relied upon is the narration of Abū Dāwūd regarding copies (of the Qur’ān). He reports with an acceptable chain from ‘Abd Khayr, ‘I heard ‘Alī رضي الله عنه saying:

أعظم الناس في المصاحف أجراً أبو بكر - رحمة الله على أبي بكر - وهو أول من جمع كتاب الله

From all the people, Abū Bakr received the greatest reward as far as the copies of the Qur’ān are concerned. May the mercy of Allah be upon Abū Bakr, he was the first person to gather the Qur’ān.¹

Nevertheless, the narration of Sulaym states that ‘Alī’s رضي الله عنه compilation was not confined to the Qur’ān. Rather, it included “its revelation, interpretation, the abrogating and the abrogated of it.”² Besides the fact that this narration is not established at all, it even contradicts the guidelines set by Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم regarding the writing of the Qur’ān, as he said:

لا تكتبوا عني شيئاً غير القرآن

Do not write anything from me (that which I say) besides the Qur’ān.³

Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم ordered that the Qur’ān should be written, but prohibited that anything else should be written alongside it, so that the one is not confused with the other. Anyway, the most that this claim establishes is that ‘Alī رضي الله عنه had a copy of the Qur’ān, just as other Ṣaḥābah, the likes of Ibn Mas’ūd رضي الله عنه⁴ had copies thereof. This does not suggest any negativity regarding the Book of Allah.

1 *Fath al-Bārī* 9/12

2 *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays* pg. 81

3 Reported by *Muslim* in *Kitāb al-Zuhd*, number 72, pg. 2298-2299, *Al-Dārimī* (his introduction) number 42, pg. 119, *Ahmad* in his *Musnad* 3/12, 21, 39. The scholars explain that the prohibition of writing the ḥadīth alongside the Qur’ān was so that one is not mixed with the other. *Al-Nawawī: Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 18/130, *al-Ubbī: Ikṃāl Ikṃāl al-Mu’lim* 7/305

4 Ibn Abī Dāwūd: *Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif* pg. 60

However, the narration does not end there. Rather, it goes on to claim that he brought it to the Ṣaḥābah and called upon them to accept it, upon which ‘Umar رضي الله عنه, according to their claims, said:

ما أغنانا بما معنا من القرآن عما تدعوننا إليه

The Qur’ān that we have with us suffices us of that to which you call us.¹

As long as the Qur’ān of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه did not just comprise of the Qur’ān itself but contained in it tafsīr and abrogated verses, it was necessary to refer to the actual Qur’ān itself. Nevertheless, this clique of bigots went on to build upon this lie, and their hate-filled imaginations destroyed their intellect.

Thus, we find that al-Ṭabarsī (from the sixth century), in *al-Iḥtijāj*, paints a different picture (as is the nature of lies; they keep changing, with additions and deletions continuously modifying them) of what transpired. He presents this (fabricated) incident as if it was a fight between ‘Alī and the Ṣaḥābah of the Rasūl صلى الله عليه وسلم — may Allah be pleased with all of them, just as they are totally innocent of these accusations.

Another addition is that whilst the narration of Sulaym claims that they rejected his copy on the first occasion, when he presented it to them, the narration of al-Ṭabarsī indicates that they took it:

فلما فتحه أبو بكر خرج في أول صفحه فضائح القوم

When Abū Bakr opened it, all the embarrassing (crimes) of the nation appeared in its first pages.²

Thus, he informs us of one of the subjects which appeared in the copy of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. However, the narration of Sulaym does not contain any explicit criticism

1 *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays* pg. 82

2 *al-Iḥtijāj* pg. 156

of the Qur'ān. The jealousy and hatred in the hearts of these bigots were not calmed down by the lies and accusations cast by them against the first battalion of Islam (who conquered their lands and spread Islam amongst their people). The appetite of these people cannot be satiated except by feeding it vulgarity regarding the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم.

The verses of the Qur'ān in which their virtues and merits are extolled strike them on the heads like iron rods and burn their filthy hearts. Thus, it is only a natural reaction on their part to concoct such lies. The narration of *al-Iḥtijāj* has yet another addition to the incident 'reported' in *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays*:

ثم أحضروا زيد بن ثابت - وكان قارئاً للقرآن - فقال له عمر: إن علينا جاء بالقرآن وفيه فضائح المهاجرين والأنصار وقد رأينا أن نؤلف القرآن ونسقط منه ما كان فضيحةً وهتكاً للمهاجرين والأنصار، فأجابه زيد إلى ذلك ثم قال: فإن أنا فرغت من القرآن على ما سألتكم وأظهر علي القرآن الذي ألفه أليس قد بطل كل ما عملتم؟ فقال عمر: فما الحيلة؟ قال زيد: أنتم أعلم بالحيلة، فقال عمر: ما حيلته دون أن نقتله ونستريح منه، فدبر في قتله

Thereafter, they had Zayd ibn Thābit, who was an expert reciter of the Qur'ān, brought (to them). 'Umar said to him, 'Alī brought a Qur'ān in which the embarrassing crimes of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār have been mentioned. We thought of compiling the Qur'ān (note that the narration of Sulaym suggests that Abū Bakr and 'Umar رضي الله عنه already had a complete copy of the Qur'ān) and deleting the crimes and transgressions of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār. Zayd ibn Thābit complied to his wishes and then said, "if I complete the Qur'ān according to your demands and then 'Alī brings the Qur'ān which he compiled, will not all of your efforts go to waste?" 'Umar asked, "so what is the way out?" Zayd replied, "you people know better." Thereupon 'Umar said, "there is no other way out besides killing him and getting rid of him. So, plan out his murder."¹

Elsewhere, he presents an account of the alleged plans regarding the murder and he explains that the task was assigned to Khālid رضي الله عنه. Thereafter Abū Bakr

1 *al-Iḥtijāj* pg. 156 (al-A'lamī print)

رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ regretted and became perturbed regarding this plan, fearing its negative consequences, to the extent that he said whilst in ṣalāh:

لَا تَقْتُلْهُ يَا خَالِد

Do not kill him, O Khālīd!

The tale then continues...¹ Later, he adds on even more to it. He asserts that ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ tried to trick ‘Alī and fool him into bringing out his Qur’ān so that they could start practicing upon it. This was an attempt by ‘Umar to distort the copy of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, who did not accept the request. ‘Umar then asked him, “when will it appear?” he replied, “it will appear with the Qā’im (imām) from my progeny. He will bring it forth and make the people practice upon it. Thus the Sunnah will come about with him — the salutations of Allah be upon him!”²

The question that remains unanswered by the narration of al-Ṭabarsī and all the other Shī‘ī books is that since their plot to kill ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was foiled and their attempt to distort his Qur’ān was a failure, why did ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ not bring out the Qur’ān that he had with him? If (they claim that) he feared them as they were in power, then what stopped him from doing so when he became the khalīfah? Why did he allow himself to be the cause of the ummah remaining astray and lost? How is it that he covered up the treachery of the deceivers and the ones who distorted the Qur’ān? He who helps a deceiver with his treachery is equally treacherous.

The clique could find no answer besides that which their scholar, Ni‘mat Allāh al-Jazā’rī assumed, i.e. he preferred displaying good character towards those who preceded him instead of the guiding the ummah.³ Thus, his (al-Jazā’rī) enmity towards both have been revealed; the Book of Allah as well as ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, as there is hardly an insult that could be worse than this (as explained previously).

1 *al-Iḥtijāj* pg. 89-90 (al-A‘lamī print)

2 *al-Iḥtijāj* 1/225-228 printed in Najaf or pg. 155-156 of the A‘lamī print.

3 We have already quoted this text before.

In addition, I would like to ask: if this was the good character shown by their Imām, then why do they oppose him instead of following in his footsteps? Why do they repeat the filthy language and vulgarity that has blackened an enormous amount of pages in their books? Thus, the reason explained above is either a lie, or they are horrible ‘followers’ of the Imām who oppose his actions. I wonder which of the two options they will find more dumbfounding.

We return to *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays*. It contains another narration, similar to the first one. However, this one has an addition; a question from Ṭalḥah رضي الله عنه to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. He enquired from him as to why he did not bring out the Qur’ān that was in his possession. ‘Alī رضي الله عنه ignored the question and continued speaking about him having a greater right to the khilāfah. Ṭalḥah then repeated the question saying:

ما أراك يا أبا الحسن أجبتني عما سألتك عنه عن القرآن ألا تظهر للناس،

O Abū al-Ḥasan, I see you have not answered my question that I asked you regarding the Qur’ān; why are you not bringing it out to the people?

‘Alī رضي الله عنه relied:

يا طلحة، عمداً كفت عن جوابك، قال: فأخبرني عما في كتب عمر وعثمان - كذا - أقرآن كله أم فيه ما ليس بقرآن. فقال طلحة: حسبي، أما إذ هو قرآن فحسبي

O Ṭalḥah I intentionally refrained from answering you. Tell me of that which is in the book of ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān, is all of it Qur’ān or does it have in it that which is not Qur’ān.

Ṭalḥah رضي الله عنه replied:

بل قرآن كله

All of it is Qur’ān.

‘Alī عليه السلام said:

قال: إن أخذتم بما فيه نجوتم من النار ودخلتم الجنة، فإن فيه حجتنا وبيان حقنا وفرض طاعتنا،

If you hold onto whatever is in it, you will be saved from the fire and you will enter Jannah, for indeed it has in it our proofs, an explanation of our rights and the compulsion of obeying us.

Ṭalḥah عليه السلام responded:

حسبي، أما إذ هو قرآن فحسبي

That suffices me. Since it is the Qur’ān, it is sufficient for me.¹

This narration of Sulaym does not criticise the Qur’ān in an open manner. In fact, it even emphasises that all that is in it is the Qur’ān. It claims that the rights of the Ahl al-Bayt and the compulsion of obeying them is found in it, whereas many of their narrations contradict this. These narrations claim:

لولا أنه زيد في كتاب الله ونقص منه لما خفي حقنا على ذي حجب

If it was not for the additions and deletions that took place in the Qur’ān, our rights would not have been obscured to those who have intelligence.²

لو قرئ القرآن كما أنزل لألفينا فيه مسمين

If the Qur’ān was recited the way it was revealed, we would find in it named (individuals).³

As is apparent, this was another twist to the tale. However, this one reveals one of the reasons as to why the tale was concocted, i.e. the twelve Imāms (whose acceptance was compulsory for the acceptance of Islam, and rejection of any one

1 *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays* pg. 124

2 *Al-Burhān* (forward pg. 37), *Biḥār al-Anwār* 19/30, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/41

3 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 1/13, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/55, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/41, *al-Lawāmi‘ al-Nūrāniyyah* pg. 547

of them was kufr) were not mentioned anywhere in the Book of Allah. This reality threatened to destroy their unions and structures. Hence, in a state of panic, they began hunting for a way to repel this threat. Among a few others, the attack upon the Book of Allah was the most dangerous plot!

Other developments that took place regarding this lie were; adding a practical aspect to it as well as the increase in its narrations. These were done courtesy of ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī (the author of the *Tafsīr*) and his student al-Kulaynī (the author of *al-Kāfī*). These two individuals were responsible for strengthening the foundation of this unfounded belief, and they had a great share in spreading and discussing it.

Their planning and ideas brought the practical aspect of this belief to its culmination. Thus, a few rules to apply this blasphemy to the Qur’ān were formulated. Among them were; adding the words “في على” (regarding ‘Alī) in any verse wherein the words “انزل الله اليك-وانزلنا اليك” (Allah revealed to you, or We revealed to you) appears, adding the words “ال محمد حقهم” (the family of Muḥammad as far as their rights are concerned) after the word “ظلموا” (they oppressed) in all verses, adding “في ولاية على” (in the matter of the wilāyah of ‘Alī) after the word “اشركوا” (they subscribed to polytheism) and they changed the word “امة” (nation) to “ائمة” (Imāms) wherever it appeared in the Qur’ān.

In this manner, they attempted to pollute the entire Qur’ān. Among the proofs for this is a narration of theirs reported by al-Kulaynī from al-Qummī, who reports with his chain from Jābir al-Ju‘fī who claims that he heard Abū Ja‘far (al-Bāqir) saying:

نزل جبرائيل بهذه الآية على محمد: بِئْسَمَا اشْتَرَوْا بِهٖ اَنْفُسَهُمْ اَنْ يَكْفُرُوا بِمَا اَنْزَلَ اللّٰهُ (في على) بَعِيْنَا

Jibrīl brought the revelation of this verse to Muḥammad ﷺ: “How wretched is that for which they sold themselves – that they would disbelieve in what Allah has revealed through [their] outrage¹ (against ‘Alī).”

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 90

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/417

Similarly, they say:

نزل جبرائيل بهذه الآية على محمد هكذا: وَإِنْ كُنْتُمْ فِي رَيْبٍ مِّمَّا نَزَّلْنَا عَلَىٰ عَبْدِنَا (في علي) فَاتُوا بِسُورَةٍ مِّنْ مِّثْلِهِ

Jibrīl brought the revelation of this verse to Muḥammad ﷺ in this manner: “And if you are in doubt about what We have sent down upon Our Servant (regarding ‘Alī), then produce a sūrah the like thereof.”^{1,2}

Another narration from Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) has it:

نزل جبرائيل - عليه السلام - على محمد بهذه الآية هكذا: ”يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْكِتَابَ آمِنُوا بِمَا نَزَّلْنَا مُصَدِّقًا لِّمَا مَعَكُمْ (في علي) نُورًا مُّبِينًا

Jibrīl brought the revelation of this verse to Muḥammad ﷺ in this manner: “O you who were given the Scripture, believe in what We have sent down, confirming that which is with you (regarding ‘Alī) a clear light.”³

Take note of how they have joined portions of two separate verses to form one.⁴ Al-Qummī says:

وأما ما هو محرف فمنه قوله: لَكِنَّ اللَّهَ يَشْهَدُ بِمَا أَنْزَلَ إِلَيْكَ (في علي) أَنْزَلَهُ بِعِلْمِهِ وَالْمَلَكُ يَشْهَدُونَ وقوله: يَا أَيُّهَا الرُّسُلُ بَلِّغْ مَا أَنْزَلَ إِلَيْكَ مِنَ رَبِّكَ ٥ (في علي) وَإِنْ لَّمْ تَفْعَلْ فَمَا بَلَغْتَ

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 23

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/417

3 Ibid

4 The first portion of the verse, “O you who were given the Scripture, believe in what We have sent down, confirming that which is with you,” was taken from verse 44 of Sūrah al-Nisā’. The words, “a clear light,” were taken from another verse of the same Sūrah, i.e.

‘يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ قَدْ جَاءَكُمْ بُرْهَانٌ مِّن رَّبِّكُمْ وَأَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكُمْ نُورًا مُّبِينًا

O mankind, there has come to you a conclusive proof from your Rabb, and We have sent down to you a clear light. (Sūrah al-Nisā’: 174)

رَسَالَتَهُ وَقَوْلُهُ: إِنَّ الدِّينَ كَفَرُوا وَظَلَمُوا (آلِ مُحَمَّدٍ حَقَّهُمْ) لَمْ يَكُنِ اللَّهُ لِيُغْفِرَ لَهُمْ وَلَا لِيَهْدِيَهُمْ
طَرِيقًا وَقَوْلُهُ: وَ سَيَعْلَمُ الَّذِينَ ظَلَمُوا (آلِ مُحَمَّدٍ حَقَّهُمْ) فِي عَمَرَتِ الْمَوْتِ

As for that which had been changed, among them are his statements:
“But Allah bears witness to that which He has revealed to you (regarding ‘Alī). He has sent it down with His knowledge, and the angels bear witness [as well],” “O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you (regarding ‘Alī) from your Rabb, and if you do not, then you have not conveyed His message,” “Indeed, those who disbelieve and commit wrong [or injustice] (regarding ‘Alī) — never will Allah forgive them, nor will He guide them to a path.”³ “And those who have wronged are going to know in the overwhelming pangs of death.”⁴

Al-Qummī says:

ومثله كثير نذكره في مواضعه

There are many others like this. We will mention them in their appropriate places.⁵

1 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 166

2 Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 67

3 Sūrah al-Nisā’, the added words (regarding ‘Alī) were taken from *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/159.

4 Note how far these people are from the Book of Allah, both physically as well spiritually. They even commit errors in their quotations from the Qur’ān (intentionally or unintentionally) and thereafter they falsely attribute this to the Ahl al-Bayt. Observe how they have foolishly and ignorantly joined a portion of the verse, “and those who have wronged are going to know to what [kind of] return they will be returned” (Sūrah al-Shu’arā: 227), to the verse, “and if you could but see when the wrongdoers are in the overwhelming pangs of death.” (Sūrah al-An’ām 93). Thus they invented a new verse; “And those who have wronged are going to know in the overwhelming pangs of death.” There is no doubt that seeing the wrongdoers suffering the “overwhelming pangs of death” and the pain at that moment serves a much greater lesson, and it is a far more profound warning compared to the statement of the Shī’ah, “they are going to know in the overwhelming pangs of death,” as someone could say that they are overcome by pain and as a result they have no understanding or idea of anything. We will not deliberate further, as this type of drivel deserves none of our attention.

5 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/10-11

As promised, he filled his book with this type of kufr¹ in the exact same manner as indicated above. In another narration, which he quotes regarding the verse of Allah, he adds on (as usual) the words ‘the family of Muḥammad’:

فَانزَلْنَا عَلَى الَّذِينَ ظَلَمُوا آلَ مُحَمَّدٍ

So We sent down upon those who wronged (the family of Muḥammad).²

Al-Qummī also reports from Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) that the following verse was recited in his presence:

كُنْتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ تَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَتَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ

You are the best nation produced [as an example] for mankind. You enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong.³

Thereupon Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) said:

خير أمة يقتلون أمير المؤمنين والحسن والحسين - عليهم السلام -؟ فقال القارئ: جعلت فداك كيف نزلت؟ قال: نزلت (كنتم خير أمة أخرجت للناس)، ألا ترى مدح الله لهم تَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَتَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ

The best nation kills Amīr al-Mu’minīn, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn? The reciter asked, “may I be sacrificed for you, how was it revealed?” He replied, “it was revealed, ‘you are the best Imāms, produced for mankind.’ Do you not see the praise of Allah regarding them? ‘You enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong.’”⁴

This means that there is no goodness in the entire ummah, as well as in the Shī‘ah. Goodness is confined to the twelve A‘immah only. Similarly, we have pointed out

1 As examples, refer to vol. 1 pg. 48, 100, 110, 122, 142, 159, 118, 123, 125, etc.

2 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/48

3 Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 110

4 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/110

that their narrations regarding the interpretation of the Qur’ān establish that the revealed word was “امة” (nation), but its interpretation is “ائمة” (A’immah). On the other hand, the narrations which ‘prove that alterations took place’ claim that the revealed word was actually “Imāms”. Is this not a contradiction?

Regarding the verse:

كَبُرَ عَلَى الْمُشْرِكِينَ مَا تَدْعُوهُمْ إِلَيْهِ

Difficult for those who associate others with Allah is that to which you invite them.¹

Al-Kulaynī reports the following additions from al-Riḍā:

كَبُرَ عَلَى الْمُشْرِكِينَ بولاية علي ما تَدْعُوهُمْ إِلَيْهِ يا محمد من ولاية علي

Difficult for those who associate others with (the Wilāyah of ‘Alī) is that to which you invite them (O Muḥammad, as far as the Wilāyah of ‘Alī is concerned). This is how it was written in the book.²

Regarding the verse:

فَسَتَعْلَمُونَ مَنْ هُوَ فِي ضَلَالٍ مُبِينٍ

And you will [come to] know who it is that is in clear error.

They add:

فَسَتَعْلَمُونَ يا معشر المكذبين حيث أنبأكم رسالة ربي في ولاية علي - عليه السلام - والأئمة من بعده،
مَنْ هُوَ فِي ضَلَالٍ مُبِينٍ

1 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 13

2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/418

And you will [come to] know, O the ones who belied when I conveyed to you the message of my Rabb regarding the Wilāyah of ‘Alī عليه السلام and the Imāms succeeding him, who it is that is in clear error.

Thereafter, they emphasize their heretical belief that interpolations took place by saying:

هكذا نزلت

This is how it was revealed.¹

In the verse:

فَلَنَنْدِيْقَنَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا عَذَابًا شَدِيدًا وَلَنَجْزِيَنَّهُمْ أَشْوَأَ الَّذِي كَانُوا يَعْمَلُونَ

But We will surely cause those who disbelieve to taste a severe punishment, and We will surely recompense them for the worst of what they had been doing.²

They add:

فَلَنَنْدِيْقَنَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا بِتَرْكِهِمْ وَلَايَةَ أَمِيرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ عَذَابًا شَدِيدًا فِي الدُّنْيَا وَلَنَجْزِيَنَّهُمْ أَشْوَأَ الَّذِي كَانُوا يَعْمَلُونَ

But We will surely cause those who disbelieve (by rejecting the Wilāyah of Amīr al-Mu’minīn عليه السلام) to taste a severe punishment (in the world), and We will surely recompense them for the worst of what they had been doing.³

There are many other narrations like this. If one compares the narration of *Tafsīr al-Qummī* and *al-Kāfī* to that which their latter day scholars, such as al-Majlisī,

1 Ibid 1/421

2 Sūrah al-Fuṣṣilat: 27

3 *Al-Kāfī* 1/421

al-Jazā'irī and al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī have mentioned, he will find a considerable increase in the narrations. This indicates that the mission of strengthening this fallacy continued in each era. The reader who understands Arabic will be convinced that these 'additions' do not fit — at all — in the verses. They have been added there without the least connection to the verse. It is as if the verse itself rejects it, as its incoherence with the Arabic language and its non-Arab concocter (whose choice of words and ability to convey meanings are quite poor), are both quite visible from it.

The words presented by these liars, as examples of verses which have been deleted, have undoubtedly removed the veil and exposed their kufr, just as it brought to shame their lies and revealed their concoctions. They are attempts at making the Qur'ān subservient to them, which are similar in nature to the lies of Musaylamah — the imposter. This is clear from the little that we have already quoted above, and it will become even clearer if one refers to the thousand plus narrations quoted by the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*.¹

The coherence of the Qur'ān and its miraculous eloquence, which left the masters of eloquence and Arabic dumbfounded and impotent as far as producing a chapter or verse of its like, is enough to expose these lies and concoctions. In fact, most of these concoctions do not even meet the standards of the average person's eloquence. Thus, they serve as a sign of the grandeur of the Qur'ān and its unmatched nature, as if it was not for bitterness, sweetness would not be appreciated. They themselves testify that the men behind them were liars, sufficing one and all the effort of looking at the proofs which establish that the Qur'ān was protected and kept pure of any interferences.

These idiotic attempts at adding the speech of humans to the speech of Allah have been the work of some members of this sect for many consecutive centuries. They tried to concoct as much of it that they could. There are other examples of this attempt, added to that which has passed. Some of them have been mentioned

¹ Refer to *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 253.

by al-Majlisī under a chapter which he named, “alterations in the verse which are against that which Allah ﷻ revealed, which were narrated by our teachers.”¹ Similarly, their books of tafsīr are filled with these adulterations, as indicated previously. All of these narrations have been gathered by the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*.²

The Rāfiḍah have counted these lies as a portion of that which was deleted from the Book of Allah. Al-Kulaynī reports in *al-Kāfi*:

أن القرآن الذي جاء به جبرائيل إلى محمد (ص) وآله وسلم سبعة عشر ألف آية

The Qur’ān that was brought by Jibrīl to Muḥammad ﷺ contained seventeen thousand verses.³

The actual amount of verses, as is well known, is slightly more than six thousand. This means that according to them, close to two thirds of the Qur’ān have been deleted. Can there be a greater lie? This narration appears in *al-Kāfi* — the most authentic of their books! However, some Shī’ah will escape by claiming, “all that is in *al-Kāfi* is not authentic.”⁴ If we take this claim seriously, instead of brushing it off as Taqiyyah, we will need to do some research as far as applying it to our case is concerned.

We will overlook that which they refer to as chains, the so called “principles and laws of authentication” that they claim to uphold, their contradictions and confusion regarding the subject⁵ and the fact that the classification “weak” only applies to the chain, as stated by them:

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/60.

2 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 253

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi Kitāb Faḍā’il al-Qur’ān Bāb al-Nawādir* 2/134

4 As examples, refer to Muḥammad Jawād Mughniyah: *al-‘Amal bī l-Ḥadīth ‘Ind al-Imāmiyyah* which appears in the book *Da‘wat al-Taqrīb* pg. 383, Muḥsin al-Amīn: *al-Shī’ah Bayn al-Ḥaqā’iq wa l-Awhām* pg. 419-420

5 This will be thoroughly explained under the chapter, “their beliefs regarding the Sunnah”.

إن أكثر أحاديث الأصول في الكافي غير صحيحة الإسناد ولكنها معتمدة لاعتبار متونها، وموافقتها للعقائد الحقّة ولا ينظر في مثلها إلى الإسناد

The chains of most of the *al-hādīth* regarding principles in *al-Kāfī* are not authentic. However, these are accepted on account of their texts, and their compliance to the correct beliefs. The chain of such (narrations) should not be paid attention to.¹

If we overlook all of the above, and rather seek an answer directly from one of their scholars, so that we could find a more accurate ruling than our own research (which would have taken place by referring to their books on ‘narrators’) we find their scholar al-Majlisī saying regarding the above narration:

فالخبر صحيح

The narration is authentic.²

The testimony of al-Majlisī holds an unparalleled position, according to them, as he is:

الشارح الممتنع للكافي الذي بين صحيحه من ضعيفه

The commentator who studied *al-Kāfī* thoroughly and differentiated between its authentic and unauthentic.³

A contemporary scholar of the Imāmiyyah, ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Muẓaffar seconds this judgement:

إنه موثق كالصحيح

It is reliable, like an authentic (narration).⁴

1 *Al-Ṣha‘rānī: Muqaddimat Sharḥ Jāmī*

2 *Mir’āt al-‘Uqūl* 2/536

3 Refer to *Mir’āt al-‘Uqūl*, Muḥammad Jawād Mughniyah: *al-‘Amal bī l-Ḥadīth wa Shurūṭuh ‘Ind al-Imāmiyyah* which appears in the book *Da‘wat al-Taqrīb* pg. 383

4 *Al-Shāfi Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 7/227

It is only fair that we mention that the author of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfī*, who is also one of their contemporary scholars, omitted this narration from his book.¹ Does this mean that he regarded it as unauthentic? This is the impression that is created by his methodology, which he explained in the forward of his book. At times, he adopts this stance, and even more pleasing stances, which — unfortunately — cannot be blindly accepted to be his actual stance. This is due to the fact that they uphold the belief of Taqiyyah to an extent explained by one of their contemporary scholars:

لكل مجتهد إمامي أن يرفض أي حديث لا يرتضيه في الكافي وغيره ويأخذ بحديث موجود في البخاري ومسلم، ولا يحق لأحد أن يحتج عليه من وجهة دينية أو مذهبية

Every Imāmī Mujtahid is allowed to reject any ḥadīth of *al-Kāfī* and other books, if it does not suit him. He should rather take the ḥadīth of *Bukhārī* and *Muslim*. None should have the opportunity of pointing a finger at him from the perspectives of religion and (his) sect.²

Thus, Taqiyyah gives him the liberty to lie in this manner. The reality, of course, is not the same as the impression he creates. This is why their celebrated scholar, al-Majlisī named a chapter, “chapter twenty eight: That which the majority report from the narrations of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, that which is authentic according to them (the Shī‘ah) and the prohibition of referring to the narrations of the opposition except when using proof against them from their own books.”³

Thus far, we discussed the authenticity of the narration. As far as the meaning is concerned, al-Māzindarānī, the commentator of *al-Kāfī* says:

ان القرآن ستة آلاف وخمسمائة والرائد على ذلك مما سقط بالتحريف

1 Refer to al-Bahbūdī: *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfī*, Kitāb Faḍl al-Qur’ān Bāb al-Nawādir 1/156-157

2 Muḥammad Jawād Mughniyah: *al-‘Amal bī l-Ḥadīth wa Shurūṭuh ‘Ind al-Imāmiyyah* which appears in the book *Da‘wat al-Taqrīb* pg. 384

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 2/214

Indeed, the Qur'ān (contains) six thousand five hundred (verses).¹ The remainder were deleted through alterations.²

Al-Majlisī says:

إن هذا الخبر وكثير من الأخبار الصحيحة صريحة في نقص القرآن وتغييره

This narration, as well as many authentic narrations explicitly (state) that deletions and alterations took place in the Qur'ān.³

These are explanatory statements of scholars from the Safavid dynasty regarding this narration. They are the ones who went all out in trying to be as extreme as possible, and perhaps they have reached the pinnacle thereof. You might be in for a surprise if you compare the explanations of these concoctions (which are kufr through and through — which were spread by scholars of the twelfth century, during the Safavid reign) to the explanations presented by Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī of the fourth century in his book *Al-I'tiqādāt*, a book that has been declared by the contemporary Shī'ī scholars to be:

من الكتب المعتبرة الموثقة

Among the reliable and trusted books.⁴

He says:

إنه قد نزل من الوحي الذي ليس بقرآن ما لو جمع إلى القرآن لكان مبلغه مقدار سبعة عشرة ألف آية، وذلك مثل قول جبرائيل .. عش ما شئت فإنك ميت، وأحب ما شئت فإنك مفارقه، واعمل ما شئت فإنك ملاقيه ..

1 I could not find this number in any of the places (in which I looked) where the number of the verses of the Qur'ān is mentioned. Refer to *Tafsīr al-Qurṭubī* 1/64-65, *Al-Itqān* 1/89, al-Feyrozābādī: *Baṣā'ir Dhawī al-Tamīz* 1/559-560.

2 *Sharḥ Jāmī* (lī al-Kāfi) 11/76)

3 *Mir'āt al-'Uqūl* 2/536

4 *Al-Dharī'ah* 13/101

The revelation which is not part of the Qur'ān is such that if it were added to the Qur'ān, it would reach a total of seventeen thousand verses. An example of them is the statement of Jibrīl, "live as long as you like, you will definitely die; love whoever you wish to love, you will most definitely leave him; do as you please, you will definitely face it."¹

He then goes on to list a few more examples. Take a look at and examine the vast difference between the statement of al-Kulaynī and the statement of Ibn Bābawayh. The one says that talks about "revelation that is not part of the Qur'ān" whilst the other says, "the Qur'ān which was brought by Jibrīl." In other words, Ibn Bābawayh says that the deficiency is not related to the Qur'ān, whereas al-Kulaynī explicitly declares that the Qur'ān is deficient.

Whilst the explanation of al-Majlisī and al-Māzindarānī (concerning the narration) were in complete harmony with the apparent meaning of the blasphemous narration, Ibn Bābawayh interpreted the extra amount to be part of the *al-Aḥādīth al-Qudsiyyah* (those aḥādīth wherein Nabī ﷺ narrates directly from Allah ﷻ). This explanation is also accommodated by the wording of the narration. However, the noteworthy point at this juncture is that none of the two were prepared to belie and reject the narration!

Is there an angle to the narration of al-Kulaynī which would make it, to some degree, acceptable (as opposed to the views and lies of al-Majlisī, al-Māzindarāzī and their likes)? It was possible (if these people were well-wishers of their religion and their followers) for them to regard the additional verses to be among those whose recitation was abrogated, if they did not have the courage to reject it. This is because these narrations can only be dealt with in one of two ways; either they should be interpreted in some way or the other, or they should be rejected. I have seen the author of *Al-Wāfi* mentioning this interpretation, after listing a few possible interpretations which affirm the blasphemous belief of alterations. He says:

1 *Al-I'tiqādāt* pg. 102

أو يكون - أي العد والزائد عما في القرآن - مما نسخ تلاوته

Or the extra amount — which is not in the Qur’ān — is from the portion which is abrogated as far as the recitation is concerned.¹

However, the contemporary Shī‘ī scholar, al-Khū‘ī² (who is their greatest Marja’), whilst acting as if he is defending the Qur’ān, says that there is no difference between saying that there were alterations and saying that abrogation as far as recitation took place.³ It is as if he wished to shut the door of interpretation and reject this established principle so that he may institute, in a very shrewd manner, a belief that he almost managed to keep hidden. The difference between alterations and abrogation is quite clear. Alterations are the acts of humans and Allah has condemned it, whilst Allah Himself abrogated verses. Allah says:

مَا نَنْسَخْ مِنْ آيَةٍ أَوْ نُنسِهَا نَأْتِ بِخَيْرٍ مِّمَّهَا أَوْ مِثْلَهَا ط

We do not abrogate a verse or cause it to be forgotten except that We bring forth [one] better than it or similar to it.⁴

This does not, in any way, imply that the Book of Allah was interfered with. If the narration of al-Kulaynī suggests that almost two thirds of the Qur’ān was disposed of, it leaves us with a little more than one third. Take into account the other narration reported by him:

نزل القرآن أثلاثاً، ثلث فينا وفي عدونا، وثلث سنن وأمثال، وثلث فرائض وأحكام

The Qur’ān was revealed in thirds; one third regarding us and our enemies, one third regarding mannerisms and parables and one third regarding obligations and laws.⁵

1 Al-Kāshānī: *Al-Wāfi* vol. 2 1/274

2 Abū al-Qāsim al-Mūsawī al-Khū‘ī (who they have granted the titles, “*al-Imām al-Akbar*”, “*al-Āyat al-‘Uẓmā*” and “*Za’im al-Ḥowzat al-‘Ilmiyyah*”): Currently, he lives in Iraq. Among his writings are *Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* and *al-Bayān fī Tafsīr al-Qur’ān*.

3 Al-Khū‘ī: *al-Bayān* pg. 210

4 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 106

5 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 2/627

So which third, according to them, has remained? Is it the one regarding mannerisms and parables or the one regarding obligations and laws? It cannot be the third relating to the Imāms and their enemies as this sacrilegious sect firmly believes that it had been deleted:

لو قرئ القرآن كما أنزل لألفينا مسمين

If the Qur'ān was read the way it was revealed, we would have found named (individuals).

This (the claim that the Imāms' names have been removed) is the actual motive, core and essence of all their attacks against the Book of Allah. This means that the ummah were totally lost all along the centuries. Since the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, they only had one third of their book. The Imāms (according to them) on the other hand, were the saviours of the ummah, as they had by them the entire Qur'ān. However, they chose not to pass it on to the ummah and left them in their pitiable condition, where they could not differentiate between their friends and enemies.

They have been promised that it will resurface with the awaited Imām. Unfortunately, more than a thousand years have passed yet neither is the awaited one making his appearance, nor is any copy of the 'original' Qur'ān available. If the ummah can be guided despite its absence, then what is the point of it being brought back by the awaited one? If it is the foundation of guidance for the ummah, then why are the Imāms being barriers between it and the ummah?

Are they happy to leave the ummah in a state of destruction, misguidance and confusion (as asserted by the Shī'ah)? Did Allah reveal His book so that it could remain imprisoned in the chamber of the 'Awaited One' and the ummah could have no real access to it? Is this really the case, even after Allah did not hand over the matter of preserving the Qur'ān to any angel or His Nabī, but rather took it upon Himself to preserve and protect it?

Their narrations state (as quoted previously) that ‘Alī (عليه السلام) was unable to bring out the original copy due to fear of it being interfered with. This, in essence, means that the ummah which was earmarked as the best ummah and selected for the guidance of the rest of humanity is itself lost, ill-fated and misguided. The only individuals from this entire ummah who are excluded from this pitiable state are the companions of the awaited one. The rest will remain isolated from the source of their guidance, prosperity and good-fortune.

All of this, despite the Imāms being granted sources and means to pass on their message that was not even granted to the *ambiyā’*. According to them, ‘Alī (عليه السلام) possessed supernatural abilities, by means of which he could have circulated the complete Qur’ān. Al-Majlisī says under the chapter, “a comprehensive collection of his miracles”:

إن علياً مر برجل يخبط: هو هو، فقال: يا شاب، لو قرأت القرآن لكان خيراً لك. فقال: إني لا أحسنه ولوددت أن أحسن منه شيئاً. فقال: ادن مني، فدنا منه فتكلم بشيء خفي، فصور الله القرآن كله في قلبه فحفظه كله

‘Alī passed by a man who was blurting out, “he, he.” Thus, he advised him, “young man, if you recite the Qur’ān, it will be better for you.” He replied, “I cannot (recite) properly, but I wish that I could read any portion of it properly.” Thereupon he (‘Alī (عليه السلام)) said, “come close to me.” He drew close to him whereupon he said something mysterious. Consequently, Allah created an imprint of the entire Qur’ān in his heart and he memorised it in its entirety.¹

Hence, ‘Alī (عليه السلام) had the ability to convey the entire Qur’ān in this ‘magical’ way to whomsoever he wished. Furthermore, he was able to adequately counter any opposition that could have come his way, as one of the chapter-headings of *al-Kāfī* states:

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 42/17

يعلم ما كان وما يكون ولا يخفي عليه شيء

He knows what happened and what is to happen. Nothing is hidden from him.¹

Similarly, it was impossible for him to be killed without his choice and happiness. The Imāms, as proclaimed by the chapter-headings of *al-Kāfī*:

يعلم ما كان وما يكون ولا يخفي عليه شيء

They know when they will die, and they do not die except by their own choice.²

If this was the degree of strength and control possessed by them, why did they then choose not to convey the Qur’ān? According to a narration of theirs, Amīr al-Mu’minīn said:

لو ثني لي الوسادة وعرف لي حقي لأخرجت لهم مصحفاً كتبه وأمله علي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

If a cushion was laid out for me and my rights were recognised, I would have taken out for them a copy which was dictated to me by Rasūlullāh ﷺ, and I wrote it out.³

Firstly, we pause at his statement:

لو ثني لي الوسادة

If a cushion was laid out for me.

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/260

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/258

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/52

This statement, according to al-Majlisī, is a reference to being granted the presidential seat.¹ How is it that after he was made the khalīfah, he failed to bring out this copy, even after he promised to do so? Did he break his promise, as asserted by the liar behind this fabrication?

The next portion of his statement is:

وعرف لي حقي

... and my rights were recognised.

How was it possible to recognise his rights when the source which explained this did not reach the masses?

The last portion of his statement, "... which was dictated to me by Rasūlullāh ﷺ," contradicts the other tales fabricated by them in which it is stated, "compilation of the Qur'ān was only completed after the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ." The reality is that all the texts regarding this lie are the greatest insults against the Ahl al-Bayt. None can match them in their accusations against the Ahl al-Bayt. Thus, the statement of one of their Imāms (as admitted in their books) is indeed undisputable. He said:

لقد أمسينا وما أحد أعدى لنا ممن يتحلل مودتنا

With the passage of time, we (found) that our greatest enemies are the ones who claim to be our lovers.²

The most amazing narration regarding this fabrication is the one which is referred to as "the satisfactory answer" of Amīr al-Mu'minīn in the book *al-Iḥtijāj* (one of their reliable works) by their scholar, al-Ṭabarsī - who belonged to the sixth century. Supposedly, this was part of an answer to a question posed by 'one of the irreligious ones'. He said:

1 Ibid 92/52

2 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 307

”... إن الكناية عن أسماء الجرائم العظيمة من المنافقين في القرآن ليست من فعله تعالى، وأنها من فعل المغيرين والمبدلين وليس يسوغ مع عموم التقية التصريح بأسماء المبدلين، ولا الزيادة في آياته على ما أثبتوه من تلقائهم في الكتاب لما في ذلك من تقوية حجج أهل التعطيل والكفر، والملل المنحرفة عن قبلتنا، وإبطال هذا العلم الظاهر الذي قد استكان له الموافق والمخالف بوقوع الاصطلاح على الاتمرار لهم، والرضا بهم.. فلأن الصبر على ولاة الأمر مفروض لقول الله عز وجل لنبيه صلى الله عليه وسلم: { فَاصْبِرْ كَمَا صَبَرَ أُولَا الْعَرْشِ مِنَ الرُّسُلِ } [الأحاف، الآية: ٣٥].. فحسبك من الجواب عن هذا الموضوع ما سمعت، فإن شريعة التقية تحظر التصريح بأكثر منه.

وأما قوله: { كُلُّ شَيْءٍ هَالِكٌ إِلَّا وَجْهَهُ } [الفصص، آية: ٨٨] فإنما نزلت كل شيء هالك إلا دينه لأن من المحال أن يهلك منه كل شيء ويبقى الوجه، هو أجل وأعظم من ذلك، إنما يهلك من ليس منه، ألا ترى أنه قال: { كُلُّ مَنْ عَلَيْهَا فَانٍ ﴿٢٦﴾ وَبَقِيَ وَجْهُ رَبِّكَ ذُو الْجَلَالِ وَالْإِكْرَامِ } [الرحمن، آية: ٢٦، ٢٧]. ففصل بين خلقه ووجهه.

وأما ظهورك على تناكر قوله: { وَإِنْ خِفْتُمْ أَلَّا تُقْسِطُوا فِي الْيَتَامَىٰ فَانكِسُّوا مَا طَابَ لَكُمْ مِنَ النِّسَاءِ } [النساء، آية: ٣]، وليس يشبه القسط في اليتامى نكاح النساء، ولا كل النساء أيتام، فهو مما قدمت ذكره من إسقاط المنافقين من القرآن، وبين [كذا في الاحتجاج]. القول في اليتامى، وبين نكاح النساء من الخطاب والقصص أكثر من ثلث القرآن، وهذا وما أشبهه مما ظهرت حوادث المنافقين فيه لأهل النظر والتأمل، ووجد المعطلون وأهل الملل المخالفة للإسلام مساعاً إلى القدح في القرآن، ولو شرحت لك كل مما أسقط وحرف وبذل مما يجري هذا المجرى لطلال، وظهر ما تحظر التقية إظهاره من مناقب الأولياء ومثالب الأعداء

The indirect reference to the names of the criminals responsible for the aghast crimes — from the hypocrites — is not the act of Allah, the Exalted. It is the act of those who distorted and altered (the Qur’ān). It is inappropriate that along with the generality of Taqiyyah, the names of the distorters should be stated. Similarly, it is inappropriate to add on to the verses which they have established in the Book after their consultation. This is because doing so will strengthen the proofs of those who wish to annihilate (Islam), the disbelievers and the people who do not adhere to our Qiblah. It will also lead to the elimination of this outward knowledge, which has been accepted by those who agree as well as the opposition, as some kind of agreement has been reached as far as obeying them and being happy with them. Also, exercising patience with the rulers is obligatory, as Allah instructs His Nabī ﷺ:

So be patient, [O Muḥammad], as were those of determination among the messengers.¹

This much is enough to answer your question, as the religion of Taqiyyah prohibits that more than this should be stated.

As for His statement:

Everything will be destroyed except His Wajh (literally; face).²

The actual revelation was, “everything will be destroyed except His religion,” as it is impossible that the rest of Him is destroyed and His face remains. He is beyond and greater than that. Only that will be destroyed which is not part of Him. Do you not see that He says:

Everyone upon it [i.e., the earth] will perish. And there will remain the Wajh of your Rabb, Owner of Majesty and Honour.³

Thus, he differentiated between His creation and His face. As for you expressing your suspicions regarding the verse:

And if you fear that you will not deal justly with the orphan girls, then marry those that please you of [other] women...⁴

(You object) that justice with the orphan is not tantamount to marrying women, and not all women are orphans. This is from that which I have already mentioned, i.e. the portions which were deleted from the Qur’ān by the hypocrites. More than one third of the Qur’ān was dedicated to speech and narratives regarding orphans and marrying women.⁵ This, and

1 Sūrah al-Aḥqāf: 35

2 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 88

3 Sūrah al-Raḥmān: 26

4 Sūrah al-Nisā: 3

5 As stated in *al-Iḥtijāj*

others similar to it are among the things which expose — for those who contemplate and ponder — the role of the hypocrites regarding it.

Also those who wish to annihilate (Islam) and those who follow religions other than Islam have found a pathway for criticism of the Qur’ān. If I were to explain to you all that had been deleted, altered and changed in this manner, it will become too lengthy. Also, it will bring to the fore that which Taqiyyah prohibits from being publicised, from the merits of the pious ones and the crimes of the enemies.¹

Despite the length of the above quotation, it is only a portion of the supposed lengthy conversation that the author of *al-Iḥtijāj* claims took place between Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī عليه السلام and one of the irreligious ones, in which ‘Alī عليه السلام debated him and attempted to guide him to the truth. Can there be anyone who is more irreligious than the one who utters such absurdities regarding the Book of Allah and the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم? We cannot fathom any enemy plotting in a manner worse than this! Mūsā Jār Allah says:

Do the worst enemies find a pathway which is more destructive to the Qur’ān and the religion (if it had any weight to it) than this statement which the scholars of the Shī’ah have attributed to Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī عليه السلام?²

Take note of the pitch-black hatred contained in this narration against the best generation known to humanity, the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. This is to the extent that it refers to them as “the criminals responsible for the aghast crimes, from the hypocrites”. All of this was on account of the jealousy which devoured the hearts of these bigots and the hatred that left no space for anything else in their souls against this unique generation who were personifications of the Qur’ān. These chauvinists could not find anything in the Qur’ān to pacify their emotions, thus they claimed, “the Qur’ān was filled with the names of the hypocrites (i.e.

1 *al-Iḥtijāj*: pg. 249-254

2 *Al-Washī’ah* pg. 123

the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ — according to them). However they were deleted by the distorters.” Their narrations of this nature are many in number.

Thereafter, the above-quoted narration goes on to state that in is inappropriate to state the names of the distorters due to the belief of Taqiyyah. Paradoxically (but not surprisingly) the same book contains another narration in which it is stated that the ones who altered the Qur’ān (according to their belief) were Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and Zayd ibn Thābit رضي الله عنه.¹ Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī adds on to the list:

والذين باشروا هذا الأمر الجسيم هم أصحاب الصحيفة أبو بكر وعمر وعثمان أبو عبيدة وسعد بن أبي وقاص وعبد الرحمن بن عوف، واستعانوا يزيد بن ثابت

The ones who carried out this grave crime were the people of the scroll; Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān, Abū ‘Ubaydah, Sa’d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ and ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf. They sought assistance from Zayd ibn Thābit.²

These were the individuals who were at the forefront of Islamic conquests and they were the vanguard of the first Muslim contingent, who engineered an unparalleled civilization. Consequently, they became a sore-sight for the eyes of these bigots and a bone in their throats. This was precisely the reason behind the specific attack, lies and accusations against this generation by these disgruntled vagabonds.

The concocted narration asserts that it is impermissible, as per the demands of Taqiyyah, to add on to the verses of the noble Qur’ān. Does this mean that it was only on account of their fear that they held back their forged copy of the Qur’ān? Does it imply that, had they nothing to fear, they would have produced a false copy of the Qur’ān? Is it possible that as long as there is some reason to fear, they will keep this copy a secret among themselves, and as soon as they are relieved of this fear, they will publicise this copy?

1 Refer to *al-Ihtijāj* pg. 156

2 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 73

The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* presents from the books of his scholars a thousand of what he refers to as ‘proofs’ in which it is alleged that verses of the Qur’ān were deleted. He also proves that most of the books of the Shī’ah confirm this. In doing so, he has undoubtedly exposed the greatest and most shameless crime of the Shī’ah. The question remains; have they done away with Taqiyyah even though their texts state that Taqiyyah will remain with them until the emergence of their Mahdī¹, or has he disobeyed the instruction of his Imām, and opposed the methodology of his people? Indeed, these are conjectures which annul one another. Soon, we will present some research regarding the question of whether or not the Shī’ah have their own copy of the Qur’ān.

The narration of *al-Iḥtijāj* goes on to claim that ‘Alī عليه السلام, during the course of his debate with the irreligious individual says that, on account of the demands of Taqiyyah, he is not allowed to state more than he already stated, as this would strengthen the proofs of those who wish to annihilate Islam. This means that Taqiyyah is discarded when speaking to an irreligious one and open kufr is uttered. As for conversations with the believers, in that case it remains obligatory.

Does this sect wish to count Amīr al-Mu’minīn among the group of this irreligious one who practices Taqiyyah before the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, but states his beliefs regarding the Book of Allah in a clear manner when speaking to the irreligious and ungodly ones? After this clear kufr, he says that adding on to this would strengthen the proofs of those who wish to annihilate. If this is a reference to the noble Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and their followers, then it undoubtedly reveals the bigotry of this sect. On the other hand, if this is a reference to anyone other than them, then how would adding on to what was already mentioned lead to disbelief regarding the Book of Allah?

These vagabonds claim that ‘Alī عليه السلام explained to the irreligious one that he was not allowed to openly claim this and explain it, as it was “obligatory to exercise patience regarding the rulers.” Shī’ī doctrine centres on the belief of negating

1 Refer to the chapter regarding Taqiyyah in this book.

the rule of anyone besides their twelve Imāms. However, this text establishes that there were rulers besides them, whose obedience was compulsory! This demolishes the very foundation of their religion, and highlights to us that lies and concoctions will always be self-contradictory.

Among the greatest accusations against Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī عليه السلام is that he disobeyed Allah, preferring to obey others, considering this to be his responsibility! It is a well-known principle in Islam that there shall be no obedience to any of the creation, if it necessitates disobedience of Allah.

وَإِنْ جَاهِدْكَ عَلَىٰ أَنْ تُشْرِكَ بِي مَا لَيْسَ لَكَ بِهِ عِلْمٌ فَلَا تُطِعْهُمَا

But if they endeavour to make you associate with Me that of which you have no knowledge, do not obey them.¹

They claim that 'Alī عليه السلام obeyed them and towed their line regarding the interpolations that took place in the Qur'ān on account of the law of the religion of Taqiyyah. This is severe defamation of the character of 'Alī عليه السلام as well as a claim that he was a disbeliever. Thus, they have attacked him, even before they could attack any of the other companions of Muḥammad صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم. From this we learn that these people are the enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt and their grudges against them are stronger than their grudges and enmity against the rest of the Muslims.

Look at how he tries to prove that it is incumbent to obey the ruler with regards to kufr from the verse of Allah:

فَاصْبِرْ كَمَا صَبَرَ أُولُو الْعَزْمِ مِنَ الرُّسُلِ

So be patient, [O Muḥammad], as were those of determination among the messengers.²

1 Sūrah Luqmān: 15

2 Sūrah al-Aḥqāf: 35

This is a clear sign that the one behind this fabrication was a complete ignoramus. This is because the purport of this verse is the exact opposite of that which he calls towards. Attributing this ‘interpretation’ to ‘Alī عليه السلام’ is an insult to him and a claim that he was an ignoramus. We also understand that this individual was either a non-Arab, who had no understanding of the Arabic language, or he was an irreligious person who played ignorant. This is established from his statement:

Everything will be destroyed except His *Wajh* (literally; face).¹

The actual revelation was, “everything will be destroyed except His religion”, as it is impossible that the rest of Him is destroyed and His face remains.²

The author of *al-Ihtijāj* goes on to claim that ‘Alī عليه السلام’ said to this irreligious one that more than a third of the Qur’ān was deleted from Sūrah al-Nisā’, and if he was to go into the details of that which was deleted and distorted in this manner, the conversation would become lengthy and that would come to the fore, which the religion of Taqiyyah prohibited from exposing.

Undoubtedly, this is among the greatest accusations against Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī عليه السلام, as he did not reveal to the Muslims, during his rule, this ‘deleted’ portion of the Qur’ān. He did not instruct anyone to add it back to the Qur’ān, follow its guidelines or practice upon its commands. Thus, these people, who howl slogans of support and love for the Ahl al-Bayt have been exposed, by means of these fabrications, to be their worst enemies. They even surpass, in their enmity for them, the Nawāṣib as they attribute to Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī عليه السلام the crime of being pleased with kufr and accepting it.

Whenever, they are unable to prove a matter, they resort to their beloved practice of Taqiyyah. Here also, we see that since he is unable to explain “that which was deleted and distorted,” he hid away behind the veil of Taqiyyah. Taqiyyah has

1 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 88

2 *Al-Khuṭūṭ al-‘Ariḍah* pg. 6

by now, been exposed to be a childish trick and an emergency exit from any confrontation. There were others, who were foolish enough to have an attempt at presenting an ‘example’ or two of verses which were deleted. However, they were badly exposed and their ploy was total failure. This was on account of the fact that these ‘examples’, when compared to the verses of the Qur’ān, were closer to the jokes and nonsensical speech of children than anything else. How could it be possible for them to come close to matching the glorious Qur’ān?

As long as the constitution of the religion of these people refers to those who uttered these profane statements regarding the Book of Allah as irreligious, as stated in the above quoted narration, should we believe the report that the orientalist Brian has in his possession an Iranian copy of the Qur’ān, which has additions to that which was revealed by Allah? Apparently, it contains a surah by the name of “al-Wilāyah”.¹ This would mean that this sect has ‘secret copies’ which they keep among themselves.

Do the Shī‘ah Circulate Among Themselves Secret Copies?

Do the Shī‘ah have a book which includes all of these fabrications and has the Shī‘ī version of tales instead of that which was revealed by Allah (which is referred to as the Qur’ān by them)? What do their tales state? What does their condition state regarding this exception? How true is the statement of Shaykh Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb, “the Shī‘ah have their own copies (of the Qur’ān) which are different to the normal copy”?²

Muḥibb al-Dīn once published a copy of a ‘concocted Sūrah’, which was named Sūrah al-Wilāyah.³ He explained that this was a photocopy from a handwritten

1 *Al-Khuṭūṭ al-‘Arīḍah* pg. 11

2 Refer to the footnotes of *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfat al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah* pg. 12

3 He published this in *al-Khuṭūṭ al-‘Arīḍah* pg. 12, *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* pg. 31, *Majallat al-Faṭḥ*, edition 842, pg. 9. This was also published, prior to his publications, by the al-Ustādh Aḥmad al-Kisrawī who was originally a Shī‘ī in his book *al-Shī‘ah wa l-Tashayyu’*.

Iranian Qur'ān, which was in the possession by Mr Brian, the orientalist.¹ This was also stated by the scholar of the Shī'ah, the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*. Prior to him, the one who passed the verdict of kufr upon the Shī'ah said, “they made up their own copy.” So now begs the question: do the Shī'ah have a secret copy which they keep among themselves, as stated by these writers?

After going through all their texts and the statements of their scholars, I say; they have narrations in which it is said that they should continue practising upon the Qur'ān until their copy appears with their awaited Imām. Al-Kulaynī says in *al-Kāfī*:

.. عدة من أصحابنا عن سهل بن زياد عن محمد بن سليمان عن بعض أصحابه، عن أبي الحسن - رضي الله عنه - قال: قلت: جعلت فداك إنا نسمع الآيات في القرآن، ليس هي عندنا كما نسمعها، ولا نحسن أن نقرأها كما بغلنا عنكم، فهل نأثم؟ فقال: لا، اقرؤوا كما تعلمتم فسيجيئكم من يعلمكم

... many of our scholars from — Sahl ibn Ziyād from — Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān from — one of his companions from — Abū al-Ḥasan عليه السلام, he says: “I said, ‘may I be sacrificed for you, we hear verses in the Qur'ān which are not in our (copies) the way we hear it, and we are not good at reciting it in the way that reached us from you people. So, will we be sinful?’” He replied, “no, recite it the way you learnt it, as the one who will teach you will soon come to you.”²

We can deduct from this text that they recite their fabrications to one another from his statement, “which are not in our (copies) the way we hear it,” and “in the way that reached us from you people”.³ They complained that they were not good at reciting that which they heard or that which reached them, whereupon

1 Muḥibb al-Dīn says that this copy was discovered to be in the possession of Brian and photocopied by one who he refers to as ‘the reliable and trustworthy one’, Muḥammad ‘Alī Sa’ūdī, who was - as stated by Shaykh Muḥibb al-Dīn - one of the high-ranking ministers of justice in Egypt. Refer to the footnotes of *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah*, pg. 32, *al-Khuṭūṭ al-‘Arīḍah* pg. 11.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*

3 There are many narrations in which it is claimed that their Imāms recite something other than the Qur'ān. *Tafsīr Furāt* says: continued on page 346

their Imām promised them that the one who will teach them will shortly appear. This promise, as they falsely claim, was fulfilled during the era of their Imām — Abū al-Ḥasan.

The words, ‘will come to you shortly,’ indicate that a teacher was to go to those who could not recite properly. However, this teacher did not come. That generation, as well as many other generations passed, yet no teacher appeared. Thereafter, the scholars of the Shī‘ah decided to re-interpret this to be a reference to their awaited Mahdī.¹ The Shī‘ah have been instructed to recite the Qur’ān and to wait for that which will be brought by their awaited one. They have been prohibited from reading their tales, due to them not being good at reciting it, as indicated by the above quoted text. Thus, they do not have a secret copy which they circulate among themselves. This is what we learn from this narration of *al-Kāfī*.

Al-Mufīd says:

إن الخبر قد صح من أئمتنا - عليهم السلام - أنهم أمروا بقراءة ما بين الدفتين، وأن لا نتعداه، بلا زيادة فيه ولا نقصان منه، حتى يقوم القائم - عليه السلام - فيقرأ الناس القرآن على ما أنزله الله تعالى وجمعه أمير المؤمنين - عليه السلام

It has been authentically reported from our Imāms that they have been commanded to recite that which is between the two covers, and we should

continued from page 345

عن حمران قال: سمعت أبا جعفر يقرأ هذه الآية: ”إن الله اصطفى آدم ونوحاً و آل إبراهيم وآل محمد على العالمين“ قلت: ليس يقرأ كذا، قال: أدخل حرف مكان حرف

Ḥumrān reports, “I heard Abū Ja‘far reciting this verse, ‘Indeed, Allah chose Ādam and Nūḥ, the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of Muḥammad over the worlds.’” I said, “it is not recited like that.” He replied, “replace a letter with another.” (*Tafsīr Furāt* pg. 18, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/56)

There are many other similar texts which indicate that they attribute recitation to the Imāms, which have nothing to do with that which Allah had revealed and that which the Muslims recite. Will anyone still regard these people as the supporters of the Ahl al-Bayt?

1 Refer to al-Māzindarānī: *Sharḥ Jāmī* (of *al-Kāfī*) 11/47. There are many other texts of the Rāfiḍah which clearly state that this is the Qā‘im or the Mahdī, as will be mentioned shortly.

not go beyond that, neither adding on, nor removing anything, until the Qā'im appears. Thereupon people will recite the Qur'ān in the manner that Allah revealed it and Amīr al-Mu'minīn compiled it.¹

Ni'mat Allāh al-Jazā'irī says:

قد روي في الأخبار أنهم عليهم السلام أمروا شيعتهم بقراءة هذا الموجود من القرآن في الصلاة وغيرها والعمل بأحكامه حتى يظهر مولانا صاحب الزمان فيرتفع هذا القرآن من أيدي الناس إلى السماء، ويخرج القرآن الذي ألفه أمير المؤمنين فيقرأ ويعمل بأحكامه

It has been reported in the narrations that he commanded his Shī'ah to recite this portion, which is found in the Qur'ān in ṣalāh and outside ṣalāh and to practise upon its commands until our master, Ṣāḥib al-Zamān, appears. Thereupon, this Qur'ān will disappear from the hands of the people to the skies and the Qur'ān that was compiled by Amīr al-Mu'minīn will appear. It will then be recited, and its commands will be acted upon.²

If this was the case, why is it that a few extra verses are narrated from each of the Imāms? Also, how can it be acceptable to practise upon an altered version? It seems as if these texts, which call towards practising upon the Qur'ān are, in a subtle way, contradicted by other texts which suggest that the Qur'ān should not be learnt, as it was — according to their belief — altered. Whoever learns the altered version will have difficulty in learning the one which will be brought by their awaited one. Al-Mufīd reports with his isnād from Jābir al-Ju'fī, who reports from Abū Ja'far (al-Bāqir):

إذا قام قائم آل محمد صلى الله عليه وآله ضرب فساطيط، ويعلم الناس القرآن على ما أنزل الله عز وجل، فأصعب ما يكون على من حفظه اليوم، لأنه يخالف فيه التأليف

When the Qā'im from the progeny of Muḥammad ﷺ will appear, he will put up tents and he will teach people the Qur'ān in the manner that

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 92/74

2 *Al-Anwār al-Nu'māniyyah* 2/363-364

it was revealed by Allah, the Most Honoured, the Most Glorified. The one who will find it most difficult is the one who memorised it today, as it is opposes its sequence.¹

This is the narration of al-Mufīd, who is revered by them to the extent that they believe that he reached a level that is beyond the reach of humans, as their awaited Imām “addressed him by the titles, ‘the righteous brother’ and ‘the guided master.’”² This narration appears in their book, *Al-Irshād*, which is among the most valued of their reliable books. Al-Majlisī says regarding it:

كتاب الإرشاد أشهر من مؤلفه

The book *Al-Irshād* is more famous than its author.³

Similarly, al-Nu‘mānī reports in *al-Ghaybah*, a narration which echoes the meaning of the above-quoted narration. He reports, with his (forged) chain of transmission to Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Alī عليه السلام that he said:

كأنني بالعجم فساطيطهم في مسجد الكوفة يعلمون الناس القرآن كما أنزل، قلت: يا أمير أو ليس هو كما أنزل؟ فقال: لا، محي منه سبعون من قریش بأسمائهم وأسماء آبائهم، وما ترك أبو لهب إلا إزراء على رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وآله - لأنه عمه

It is as if I am with the non-Arabs, their tents are put up in the Masjid of Kūfah, and they are teaching the people Qur’ān in the manner that it was revealed. I asked, “O Amīr al-Mu‘minīn, is it not (found) in the way it was revealed?” He replied, “No! The names of seventy people from Quraysh, along with the names of their fathers have been deleted. Abū Lahab was only left so that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم could be disgraced, as he is his paternal uncle.”⁴

1 Al-Mufīd: *Al-Irshād* pg. 413

2 The preface of the book in which all the addresses of the awaited Mahdī to al-Mufīd, which appear in *al-Ihtijāj*, have been recorded, pg. 277.

3 Al-Majlisī: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/27

4 Al-Nu‘mānī: *al-Ghaybah* pg. 171-172, *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, scroll seven, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/60

Al-Nu'mānī quotes two narrations¹ which convey the same meaning. It seems as if the one who fabricated this narration was an irreligious non-Arab, as he confines the promised teaching to them. The deep hatred that he carries in his heart for the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, who conquered the lands of his people and spread Islam between them is also quite apparent in his narration. Thus, he pacifies himself, upon not finding their names alongside the name of Abū Lahab, by saying that the Qur'ān was altered.

This narration, which discourages the learning of the Qur'ān, had a strong effect upon Shī'ī communities. This was witnessed by Mūsā Jār Allah, who spent some time in their communities and could not find any of their students or teachers who memorised the Qur'ān. In fact, he did find someone who could recite even a portion of it correctly, leaving no question of whether any of them had any idea of the different manners of recital. His opinion was that this was a result of the Shī'ah anticipating the copy of 'Alī ᷓ, which disappeared along with the Qā'im from the 'progeny of Muḥammad ﷺ'.²

1 Refer to *al-Ghaybah* pg. 194, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/364

2 Al-Washī'ah pg. 116. There are other narrations in their books which encourage the learning of the Qur'ān and memorising it. They also mention some rewards for the one who does so. One example is the narration of Abū Ja'far (al-Bāqir), who said to one of his companions, Sa'd al-Khaffāf:

يا سعد، تعلموا القرآن..

O Sa'd, learn the Qur'ān...(Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/596)

The author of *al-Kāfī* then adds the chapter, "the chapter regarding the one who memorises the Qur'ān and then forgets it." Under this chapter, he quotes six narrations in which the reward that is lost out by the one who forgets a portion of the Qur'ān is mentioned. (Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/607-609). He adds another chapter titled, "the chapter regarding its recital". Under this chapter, he reports from Abū 'Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq):

القرآن عهد الله إلى خلقه فقد ينبغي للمراء المسلم أن ينظر في عهده وأن يقرأ منه في كل يوم خمسين آية

The Qur'ān is the bequest of Allah (directed) towards His creation. Therefore, it is necessary for a Muslim to look at His bequest and recite fifty verses thereof daily. (Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/609)

Similarly, he has another chapter heading, "the houses in which Qur'ān is recited". In it is a narration; Layth ibn Abī Sulaym reports from Rasūlullāh ﷺ: *continued on page 350*

Have the Shī'ah gathered all of their lies in one place to facilitate easy learning of the promised copy, when it does appear? Al-Majlisī quotes al-Mufīd:

”.. نهونا عليهم السلام عن قراءة ما وردت به الأخبار من أحرف يزيد على الثابت في المصحف، لأنه لم يأت على التواتر وإنما جاء بالأحاد، وقد يلغط الواحد فيما ينقله، ولأنه متى قرأ الإنسان بما يخالف ما بين الدفتين غرر بنفسه مع أهل الخلاف، وأغرى به الجبارين، وعرض نفسه للهلاك، فمنعونا عليهم السلام من قراءة القرآن بخلاف ما يثبت بين الدفتين لما ذكرناه

They have prohibited us from reciting the additional portions which appear in the narrations, which do not appear in the (original) copy, as it is not reported with tawātur. It can only be established through aḥād, and a single person can err in that which he transmits. Added to that, whenever a person recites anything other than what is between the two covers, he puts his life at risk, at the hands of the opposition and he provokes the oppressors. He puts his life in danger, so they have prohibited us from reciting the Qur'ān against that which is established between the two covers, for the reasons that we have mentioned.¹

continued from page 349

نوروا بيوتكم بتلاوة القرآن ولا تتخذوها قبوراً

illuminate your houses with the recitation of the Qur'ān, and do not make them graves. (*Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 2/610)

Another chapter heading reads, “the reward of reciting the Qur'ān”. Herein, seven narrations discuss the great rewards of the one who recites and learns the Qur'ān. (*Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 2/611-613). One chapter heading is, “reciting the Qur'ān from a copy”. This chapter contains five narrations which state the reward of reciting the Qur'ān whilst looking into a copy of it. (*Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 2/613-614).

There are other chapters which contain the same message. These contradict the other narrations. In fact, it is proof — from their own books — that their ‘narrations’ from the Ahl al-Bayt are forgeries and concoctions. Otherwise, how was it possible that he instructed the recitation of the Qur'ān, mentioned that great rewards are received by the one who recites it, encouraged all Muslims to recite it daily and illuminate their houses by means of it; if he believed that it was distorted? Does this not point out the great contradiction that exists in their religion?

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/74-75

This means that the concocted verses which contradict the revelation of Allah, which are spread out in their books have not been compiled in a copy that could be circulated due to two reasons; firstly, their fear of the Muslims, and secondly, it is only established through āḥād narrations, and a single person could commit an error in that which he narrates. It should be noted that the hesitance as far as accepting the āḥād narrations is confined to the Uṣūlīs. As for the Akhbārī Shī'ah, they believe that anything which is narrated by their scholars from the Imāms, in the many books that they have authored, is authentic, mutawātir and established from its author. Their āḥādīth are thus, established from the infallibles.¹

Hence, they accept every narration regarding this concoction, which appears in the books of their scholars. This is why the scholar of the Shī'ah, who they describe as “*Imām al-Fuqahā al-‘Izām Ra’īs al-Islām*” (the forerunner of the great jurists, the leader of Islam), Ja’far Kāshif al-Ghiṭā says:

وصدرت منهم - يعني من الأخباريين - أحكام غريبة وأقوال منكرة، منها قولهم بنقص القرآن مستندين إلى روايات تقضي البديهة بتأويلها وطرحها..

Strange laws and incorrect utterances have emerged from them (the Akhbārīs). Among them is their view that the Qur’ān was shortened, which they base upon such narrations which are obviously meant to either be interpreted or rejected.²

Thus, the Akhbārīs believe in the authenticity of all of these tales which appear in the books of their scholars. (Yes, you may express surprise at their acceptance of every letter that appears in these books which are attributed to their scholars — despite the great degree of incongruity in the chains and texts of the narrations — and their simultaneous attacks upon the Book of Allah) They believe obvious lies and reject established realities. Can there be a punishment greater than this kind of deformation? Their temperaments, intellects and standards have all been overturned.

1 *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 20/61

2 Ja’far Kāshif al-Ghiṭā: *Ḥaqq al-Mubīn* from al-Ṭabaṭabā’ī: *Al-Anwār al-Nu’māniyyah* (footnote) 2/359

Nonetheless, the reason cited, that it cannot be spread due to it being transmitted through āḥād narrations, is a matter that is not agreed upon by the Shī'ah. The reason that is agreed upon is that of fear. This means that the circulation of a secret version by the Akhbārīs is highly possible. Perhaps this is the explanation to that which was published by Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb and Aḥmad al-Kisrawī (who was originally a Shī'ī) regarding Sūrah al-Wilāyah, which was photocopied from the Iranian copy.¹

However this was a mere compilation of all those fabrications, which — according to them — are examples of that which appears in the copy of 'Alī عليه السلام. As for the copy itself, it remains hidden and anticipated, just like their awaited Mahdī, who has not yet appeared. The Qur'ān will be practised upon until he makes his appearance. The compilation of these fabrications was merely to lull the sceptics and confused ones among them.

A point that I have noted from the speech of their scholars is that they have no difference of opinion regarding the existence of the copy of Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī عليه السلام. This is to the extent that even those who outwardly reject the view that alterations took place, from the classical as well as contemporary scholars such as Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (in *Al-I'tiqādāt* — as will appear) and al-Khū'ī (in *al-Bayān*) believe that the copy of 'Alī عليه السلام does exist.²

The only question is; does it contain additional verses or rather, the additions are regarding the interpretations and sequence? This question will be answered shortly.

1 These fabrications have been gathered by the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* and arranged according to the Sūrahs of the Qur'ān. However, they are not in the form of a complete copy. A copy from Pakistan came into my possession, which was printed by the Shī'ah there. The publishers filled up this copy with their fabrications. However, they did not interfere with the original text. Rather, it was published like *Tafsīr Jalālayn*, i.e. the text of the Qur'ān was placed in the centre and the rest was placed around it.

2 *Al-Bayān* pg. 223

The “Copy of ‘Alī”

We have already stated that the copy of ‘Alī عليه السلام was mentioned in the first book written by the Shī‘ah, just as it was mentioned in some narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah — which have been categorised as unauthentic, as explained by the expert on the subject, Ibn Ḥajar. However, the picture painted by the books of the Shī‘ah is a different one, as explained. They have discussed this copy greatly and — according to their beliefs — it contains additions to the Book of Allah.

An all-out effort was made by the ‘reliable one’ of their religion, al-Kulaynī to spread this lie, in his book *al-Kāfī*. He dedicated a special chapter to it named, “the Qur’ān was not compiled in its complete form by anyone except the Imāms.” Thereafter, he quoted six of their narrations to prove this. Among them was that which he narrated from Jābir al-Ju‘fī, who claimed to have heard Abū Ja‘far (al-Bāqir) saying:

ما ادعى أحد من الناس أنه جمع القرآن كله كما أنزل إلا كذاب، وما جمعه وحفظه كما نزله الله تعالى إلا علي بن أبي طالب والأئمة من بعده

No person has claimed to have gathered the entire Qur’ān in the form that it was revealed, except that he was a great liar. None gathered it and memorised it in the manner that it was revealed by Allah سبحانه وتعالى except ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and the Imāms who appeared after him.¹

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/228. Take note that this narration was reported by Jābir al-Ju‘fī, who is considered a liar by the Ahl al-Sunnah. Added to that, the books of the Shī‘ah state that he did not have a good relationship with Abū Ja‘far. (Refer to *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 191). Thus, this narration is one of his many lies. Al-Kulaynī, who wished to spread this lie did not find anything questionable with it. If the Qur’ān was not gathered by anyone besides ‘Alī عليه السلام, then where is that which he gathered? If he had gathered it, then what was the need for the “Imāms who appeared after him” to gather it? Unless they believe that the Imāms had a share in gathering it, although they did not even exist when it was being gathered. How is it possible that the majority have not seen this book, and no Muslim knew about it? How can this accusation be accepted, which was transmitted by a handful of liars, especially when the consensus of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم — including ‘Alī عليه السلام — upon practicing on this glorious Qur’ān and submitting to it, is being rejected? Furthermore, all the leading scholars of the ummah (which obviously included scores of scholars from the Ahl al-Bayt) upheld this consensus. These are undoubtedly baseless statements which cannot be accepted by a brain that is free from wayward desires and sinister motives. These can never enter a heart that is imbued with imān.

In *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, the best book of tafsīr according to them, it is reported from Abū Ja‘far (al-Bāqir) عليه السلام:

ما أحد من هذه الأمة جمع القرآن إلا وصي محمد صلى الله عليه وآله

No person of this ummah gathered the Qur’ān except the Waṣī of Muḥammad عليه السلام.¹

The narration of al-Kulaynī creates the impression that each Imām gathered the Qur’ān. Thus, it seems as if there are a few copies, not just one. However, the narration of al-Kulaynī contradicts this by explicitly stating that ‘Alī عليه السلام alone gathered it. Their narrations and chapter headings also state that whoever claims that the Qur’ān was gathered by anyone besides the Imāms is a great liar. This is despite the fact that they assert that it was compiled in the era of Nabī عليه السلام. This, they ‘prove’ from a narration which appears in *Al-Biḥār*.² Was it Ḥasan, Ḥusayn عليهما السلام and the rest of the Imāms who took up the responsibility of compiling it in his عليه السلام era?

Some narrations have it that some of the Shī‘ah discovered this copy. One narration states:

.. عن ابن الحميد قال: دخلت على أبي عبد الله - رضي الله عنه - فأخرج إليّ مصحفًا، قال: فتصفحته فوقع بصري على موضع منه فإذا فيه مكتوب: ”هذه جنهم التي كنتم بها تكذبان. فاصليا فيها لا تموتان فيها ولا تحيان

Reported from Ibn Ḥumayd; he says, “I entered the presence of Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq), who took out and presented to me a copy. I went through it whereupon my eyes fell upon a portion of it. I found that it stated, ‘this is the Hell-fire that the two of you would belie. So enter into it; you will not die there or live.’”

1 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* pg. 744 (printed in Iran), *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/48

2 *Al-Mar‘ashī: al-Ma‘ārif al-Jaliyyah* pg. 7

Al-Majlisī says:

يعني الأولين

This is a reference to the first two.¹

They are referring to the two beloveds of the Rasūl ﷺ, his two fathers-in-law, successors, viziers and the best of the creation after the Rasūl, the *ambiyā'*; i.e. Abū Bakr and 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا. This narration allows the chosen companions of the Imāms to take a look at the contents of their version or copy of the "Qur'ān". However, another narration of *al-Kāfī* contradicts this. Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Naṣr says:

دفع إليّ أبو الحسن مصحفاً وقال: "لا تنظر فيه، ففتحته وقرأت فيه: لم يكن الذين كفروا؛ فوجدت فيها اسم سبعين رجلاً من قريش بأسمائهم وأسماء آبائهم قال: فبعث إليّ: ابعث بالمصحف

Abū al-Ḥasan gave a copy to me and said, "do not look into it." I opened it and read in it, '*lam Yakun...* (Those who disbelieved were not...)," I found in it the names of seventy men of Quraysh, along with the names of their fathers. Thereupon he sent (someone to me saying), "send the copy."²

In this narration, the Imām entrusted one of his confidants with the copy and prohibited him from taking a look at what is inside it. However, he opposes his Imām and he abuses the trust that was placed on him. He does not only read the contents but also spreads it. Thus, the copy which is referred to in this narration is a secret copy which is to be kept hidden from the general public as well as the chosen ones. None should read it except the Imām.

The narrator indicates that among the contents of this copy is the declaration that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were disbelievers. Thus, this is not the Book of Allah, which was revealed for the benefit of humanity — in which the merits of the

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 92/48

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/631

Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم are extolled. Rather, it is a copy that is circulated by the hands of the Bāṭiniyyah in a very secretive manner. In it, there are forgeries against the Ahl al-Bayt; another act aimed at disgracing them.

This fabrication appears once again, with wording that is different to the previous narration. *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* reports from al-Bazanṭī¹ that al-Riḍā handed to him that alleged copy. Al-Bazanṭī said:

و كنت يوماً وحدي ففتحت المصحف لأقرأ فيه، فلما نشرته نظرت فيه في "لم يكن" فإذا فيها أكثر مما في أيدينا أضعافه، فقدمت على قراءتها فلم أعرف شيئاً فأخذت الدواة والقرطاس فأردت أن أكتبها لكي أسأل عنها، فأتاني مسافر قبل أن أكتب منها شيئاً، معه منديل و خيط وخاتمه فقال: مولاي يأمرك أن تضع المصحف في المنديل وتختمه وتبعث إليه بالخاتم، قال: ففعلت

One day, I was alone, so I opened the copy to read from it. When I spread it out, I looked in it at Lam Yakun. I found that it had much more than what was in our copy. I tried to read it but I could not understand anything. Thus, I took some ink and a paper and I was about to write it down, so that I could ask regarding, when all of a sudden a traveller came to me (before I could even write anything) carrying a handkerchief, a thread and a seal. He said, "my master commands you to place the copy in the handkerchief, seal it and send it to him with the seal." I complied.²

This al-Bazanṭī says in this narration, "I did not understand anything from it", yet in the previous narration, he is reported to have said that he found in it the

1 Al-Bazanṭī is the narrator of the previous fabrication. This individual, who reports these lies and makes claims against the Book of Allah, the Ṣaḥābah and the close relatives of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم is considered by them to be reliable (although he abused the trust that his Imām placed in him and he disobeyed him). *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* of al-Khūṭī states:

وقيل: أبو علي المعروف بالزنطي، كوفي ثقة لقي الرضا، وكان عظيم المنزلة عنده، روى عنه كتاباً، ومات سنة 221 هـ

It is said, Abū 'Alī. He was commonly known as al-Bazanṭī. He is a Kūfī and he is reliable. He met al-Riḍā and he held a great position in his sight. He narrated a book from him. He passed away in the year 221 A.H. (*Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* 2/231)

2 *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* pg. 246, from *Bihār al-Anwār* 92/51

names of seventy people from Quraysh along with the names of their fathers. Another narration of his, which appears in *Rijāl al-Kashshī* paints yet another picture of what had transpired. It says:

عن أحمد بن محمد بن أبي نصر قال: لما أتني أبي الحسن رضي الله عنه أخذ به على القادسية، ولم يدخل الكوفة، أخذ به على برّاني البصرة، قال: فبعث إليّ مصحفاً وأنا بالقادسية ففتحته فوَقعت بين يديّ سورة "لم يكن" فإذا هي أطول وأكثر مما يقرأها الناس، قال فحفظت منه أشياء قال: فأُتِيَ مسافر ومعه منديل وطين وخاتم فقال: هات: فدفعته إليه فجعله في المنديل، ووضع عليه الطين وختمه فذهب عني ما كنت حفظت منه، فجهدت أن أذكر منه حرفاً واحداً فلم أذكره

Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Naṣr says; when Abū al-Ḥasan عليه السلام was brought, he was taken to al-Qadisiyyah, and he did not enter al-Kūfah. ‘Alī Barrānī took him to Baṣrah, so he sent a copy to me whilst I was in al-Qādisiyyah. I opened it and the sūrah Lam Yakun appeared before me. It was larger and lengthier than that which the people recite. I memorised portions of it. Then, a traveller came, who had with him a handkerchief, clay and a seal. He said, “bring!” thereupon, I handed it to him. He placed it in the handkerchief, placed clay upon it and sealed it. Thereafter, whatever I had memorised escaped me. I tried to recall a single word, but I was unable to do so.¹

These are three narrations, all from this al-Bazanṭī. In the narration of *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt*, he claims that he did not understand any of that which he read, and he tried to write that which he read, but before he could do that, he was approached by the messenger of the Imām. In the narration of al-Kashshī, he claims that he memorised a portion of it, but this was forgotten as soon as the copy went out of his possession. In the narration of *al-Kāfi*, we learn that he understood that which he read, and he managed to recall that which he memorised. It was with regards to the enemies of the ummah from Quraysh. Contradictory tales, as is the case with all fabrications.

If it was difficult to write down anything from it, or to memorise a portion of it, then how were the alleged verses written and memorised (and later transmitted)?

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 588-589

Indeed, these are tales which belie one-another. The narrations of the Shī'ah claim that this copy is in the possession of their awaited Imām. Their scholar, Ni'mat Allāh al-Jazā'irī says:

إنه قد استفاض في الأخبار أن القرآن كما أنزل لم يؤلفه إلا أمير المؤمنين - إلى أن قال: - وهو الآن موجود عند مولانا المهدي رضي الله عنه مع الكتب السماوية وموارث الأنبياء

It appears in many narrations that the Qur'ān, in the manner in which it was revealed, was not gathered by anyone besides Amīr al-Mu'minīn... Right now, it is in the possession of our leader, al-Mahdī, along with the heavenly books and the inheritance of the ambiyā'.¹

Added to that, some copies which were in the possession of the Shī'ah, were believed by them to have been written by 'Alī عليه السلام. Ibn al-Nadīm (a Shī'ī) says that he saw a Qur'ān which had the handwriting of 'Alī عليه السلام. One of the families who claim to be from the offspring of Ḥasan عليه السلام have been passing it down the generations.² Ibn 'Anbah — who claims to be of 'Alawī descent — indicates towards two copies that were written by Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī عليه السلام. One of them comprises of three volumes and the other is just one volume. He saw them himself, but they were burnt when the Mash-had caught on fire.³

Abū 'Abd Allah al-Zanjānī, one of the leading contemporary Shī'ī scholars, says:

ورأيت في شهر ذي الحجة سنة ١٣٥٣ هـ في دار الكتب العلوية في النجف مصحفًا بالخط الكوفي كتب على آخره: كتبه علي بن أبي طالب في سنة أربعين من الهجرة

I saw in the month of Dhū al-Hijjah, in the year 1353 A.H, in Dār al-Kutub al-'Alawiyyah in Najaf, a copy that was written in the Kūfī script. At the end of it, the following was written, “this was written by 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib in the year 40 A.H.”⁴

1 *Al-Anwār al-Nu'māniyyah* 2/360-362

2 *Al-Fahrist* pg. 28

3 *'Umdat al-Ṭālib fī Ansāb Āl Abī Ṭālib* pg. 130-131

4 Al-Zanjānī: *Tārīkh al-Qur'ān* pg. 67-68

This is why Mīrzā Makhdūm al-Shīrāzī (who lived among the Shī'ah and read many of their books, as stated previously) said:

Among the ironies is that despite this (their claim of alterations) they believe that many of the copies of the Qur'ān were by 'Alī عليه السلام and the Imāms from his progeny. However, they did not contain anything more than that which is found in the rest of the copies, (the contents of) which are mutawātir, and are too many to be counted.¹

These supposed viewings of the copy of 'Alī عليه السلام clearly contradict their claim that the copy of 'Alī is in the possession of their awaited Mahdī. There can be no doubt that Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī عليه السلام would recite and govern by nothing besides the copy upon which the Ṣaḥābah had consensus. Ibn Abī Dāwūd reports with an authentic chain from Suwayd ibn Ghafalah who narrates that 'Alī عليه السلام said:

لا تقولوا في عثمان إلا خيراً، فوالله ما فعل في المصاحف إلا عن ملامنا

Speak nothing but good regarding 'Uthmān, for — by the oath of Allah — he did not do anything as far as the copy is concerned, except that it was in conjunction with a group from us.²

This has been reported in the books of the Shī'ah, as will appear shortly. *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* has it that when Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Uthmān عليه السلام completed the compilation of the Qur'ān, he sent one copy to each land, and he ordered that all other written forms of the Qur'ān, be it on a loose page or in a complete book, should be burnt.³ It is possible that on account of this, the copy of 'Alī عليه السلام — which they claim existed — was also burnt.

It should also be noted that among the famous *Qurrā'* (experts of the Qur'ān, from the aspect of recitation) there are some whose chain include members of the Ahl

1 *Al-Nawāqid* scroll 104 of the manuscript

2 *Faṭḥ al-Bārī* 13/18

3 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (with *Faṭḥ al-Bārī* 13/11)

al-Bayt. It is on this basis that Dr ‘Abd al-Ṣabūr Shāhīn proves that the Ahl al-Bayt had nothing to do with this fabrication and that the claims the Shī‘ah regarding them were nothing but false allegations. Among the seven famous Qurra’ is Ḥamzah al-Zayyāt whose chain is:

Ḥamza al-Zayyāt from — Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq from — Muḥammad al-Bāqir from — Zayn al-‘Ābidīn from — his father (Ḥusayn عليه السلام) from — his father (‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام).¹

Thus, these pious personalities, who belonged to the Ahl al-Bayt, did not differ with the consensus of the Muslims and the copy of ‘Uthmān عليه السلام. One of the signs that indicate their approval of it is that they taught the contents thereof to the masses without adding or removing a single letter, or claiming anything that could raise doubts regarding the Book of Allah.²

Dr Muḥammad Baltājī says:

We can add to that the fact that the recital of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام of the Qur’ān has been narrated from Zayd ibn ‘Alī (the brother of Imām Bāqir and the paternal uncle of Imām al-Ṣādiq). This is admitted by the Imamī Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah as well.³

I would like to add on to this an admission and acknowledgement of another Shī‘ī scholar, al-Majlisī. He says:

والقراء السبعة إلى قراءته (يعني قراءة علي) يرجعون، فأما حمزة والكسائي فيقولان على قراءة علي.. وأما نافع وابن كثير وأبو عمرو فمعظم قراءتهم يرجع إلى ابن عباس، وابن عباس قرأ على أبي بن كعب وعلي، والذي قرأ هؤلاء القراء يخالف قراءة أبي فهو إذا مأخوذ عن علي - عليه السلام -.

¹ ‘Abd al-Ṣabūr Shāhīn: *Tārīkh al-Qur’ān* pg. 170

² Ibid pg. 165

³ *Manāḥij al-Tashrī‘ al-Islāmī* 1/189, the reference cited from the sources of the Shī‘ah is *Ta’sīs al-Shī‘ah* li ‘Ulūm al-Islām pg. 285, 343, *al-Fahrist* of al-Ṭūsī pg. 115

وأما عاصم فقرأه على أبي الرحمن السلمي وقال أبو عبد الرحمن: قرأت القرآن كله على علي بن أبي طالب عليه السلام، فقالوا: أفصح القراءات قراءة عاصم لأنه أتى بالأصل وذلك أنه يظهر ما أدغمه غيره، ويحقق من الهمز ما لينه غيره.. والعدد الكوفي في القرآن منسوب إلى علي عليه السلام وليس في الصحابة من ينسب إليه العدد غيره، وإنما كتب عدد ذلك كل مصر عن بعض التابعين

The seven Qurra' all refer to his *qirā'ah* (recital). As for Ḥamzah and al-Kisā'i, their (Qirā'ah) goes up to 'Alī. As for Nāfi', Ibn Kathīr and Abū 'Amr, most of their qirā'ah is from Ibn 'Abbās and Ibn 'Abbās learnt from Ubay ibn Ka'b as well as 'Alī. The *qirā'āt* (plural of qirā'ah) of these (three) opposes the qirā'ah of Ubay. Thus, it is taken from 'Alī.

As for 'Āṣim, he learnt from Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī who said, "I recited the entire Qur'ān to 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام." Thus they say, "the most distinct qirā'ah is the qirā'ah of 'Āṣim, as he done that which was the original (law), i.e. he does *izhār* (to recite each letter separately upholding all its dimensions) of that which others do *idghām* (to combine two letters either entirely, or as far as their qualities of articulation are concerned) of, and he recites the Ḥamzah distinctly in cases where others pronounce it lightly..." Further, the Kufic count of the Qur'ān is attributed to 'Alī. None of the other Ṣaḥābah have any count attributed to them. Rather, each city recorded that from one of the Tābi'īn.¹

In fact, they even claim, as stated by their scholar, 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Ṭāwūsī al-'Alawī al-Fātimī in his book *Sa'd al-Sa'ūd*:

ثم عاد عثمان فيجمع المصحف برأي مولانا علي بن أبي طالب - رضي الله عنه -

Thereafter 'Uthmān returned and compiled the Qur'ān according to the view of our master, 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام.²

They also claim that 'Alī عليه السلام said:

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 92/53-54, *Manāqib Āl Abī Ṭālib* 2/42-43

2 From *Tārīkh al-Qur'ān* of l-Zanjānī, who is among the contemporary Shī'ah pg. 67

أيها الناس الله الله إياكم والغلو في أمر عثمان وقولكم حراق المصاحف فوالله ما حرقها إلا عن ملأ من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

O people! Fear Allah, fear Allah! Be careful not fall into extremism regarding the matter of ‘Uthmān, and (stay away from) your derogatory title, “the one who burnt the Qur’ān”. By the oath of Allah, he did not burn the Qur’ān except in conjunction with a group from the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.¹

There is even more to it than this. They say:

إنه ورد عن أهل البيت عليهم السلام أن عثمان بن عفان لما رأى اختلاف الصحابة في قراءة القرآن طلب من علي عليه السلام مصحف فاطمة الذي كانت هي - سلام الله عليها - دونته بإشارة أبيها، وطابقه مع المصاحف الأخرى التي كانت بيد الصحابة، فما طابق منها مصحف فاطمة نشره وما لم يطابقه أحرقه. فعلى هذا يكون المصحف الذي بأيدينا مصحف فاطمة لا مصحف عثمان، وعثمان كان ناشره لا مدونه ومرتبته

It has been reported from the Ahl al-Bayt عليهم السلام that when ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān saw the differences in the recitation of the Qur’ān of the Ṣaḥābah, he asked ‘Alī عليه السلام for the copy of Fāṭimah عليها السلام, which she compiled upon the indication of her father. He compared it to the other copies which were in the possession of the Ṣaḥābah. He published whatever conformed to the copy of Fāṭimah, and burnt whatever did not conform to it. Hence, the copy that in our hands is the copy of Fāṭimah, not the copy of ‘Uthmān. He was just the one who disseminated it. He did not gather it or compile it.²

Does not all of this destroy their claims and all that they have built upon them? It is another proof of the contradictions in their narrations. This kind of contradictions is a definite sign of the falsity of the religion. It appears, from the last quotation, that there is an effort on their part to retract from their view, which made them targets of contempt, brought upon them shame and criticism and destroyed their religion, without having any effect upon the Qur’ān.

1 *Tārīkh al-Qur’ān* of I-Zanjānī pg. 68

2 *Al-Mar’ashī: al-Ma’ārif al-Jaliyyah* pg. 27

However, retracting from this view brings upon them another dilemma and contradiction; this Qur’ān was transmitted to us by Abū Bakr and ‘Uthmān and their brethren رضي الله عنهم. These are the very individuals who have received the greatest amount of vilification, revilement and verdicts of kufr against them from the Shī’ah. How is it then possible that one heart and one mind can accept the authenticity of the Qur’ān and simultaneously believe that its compilers were traitors?

Perhaps they concocted the last quotation (in which it is stated that ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه compared the Qur’ān to the supposed copy of Fāṭimah) to get them out of this predicament. However, this places them in a third dilemma and contradiction, i.e. it contradicts their narrations which claim that the copy of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها is something other than the present Qur’ān.¹ That which is established from ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه is that he sent a message to Ḥafṣah رضي الله عنها saying, “send to us the pages, we wish to copy them into books.”² However, these people made this out to be something that took place between ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه and Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, as is their habit in attributing the merits of the ambiyā’ and Ṣaḥābah to the twelve Imāms, by distorting aḥādīth and modifying them in their books, so that they fit upon the Imāms. With regards to the verses of the Qur’ān; they seek ‘secretive’ interpretations or they claim that alterations took place, as you have already seen.

The Amount of Narrations Pertaining to this Fabrication in the Books of the Shī’ah, and the Weight that it Holds According to Them

We have seen that most of the books of the Shī’ah have sunk into this brackish quagmire, and they fell into this dangerous abyss. What we now need to determine is the extent and degree of this fall. Do those murky narrations, which found their way into their books and ḥadīth sources dress the one who inclines towards them with the garment of shame and disgrace? Do they snatch from him the last bit of his relationship that he had with Islam?

1 Refer to the discussion regarding Fāṭimah under the topic, “having Īmān upon the Book”.

2 Refer to *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (with *Fatḥ al-Bārī* 13/11)

Are these narrations nothing more than ‘strange narrations’ which were somehow shoved into their books, without being endorsed by their intellectuals, or accepted by their research scholars? Were they injected into the books on account of the many “fabricators against the Imāms”, as stated in the books of the Shī‘ah, who infiltrated their ranks? Is it because Tashayyū‘ was always a fertile ground for all those who wished to harm Islam and its adherents in any way, as proven from events and occurrences?

We have seen that this tale began with two narrations in the book of *Sulaym ibn Qays*, according to the printed copy that is before us. However, it was not long before it became a huge lie and its narrations increased. ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, the leading scholar of the Shī‘ah, made it his duty to amplify this lie and thus he will bear all the repercussions of this kufr.

He reported many narrations regarding this, after stating in his introduction that they are of a large number. He started off an attempt to form a methodology by which this fabrication could be practically implemented, as was explained. It should also be noted that most of the narrations of al-Kulaynī, the author of *al-Kāfī* are from this al-Qummī, who grabbed onto anything and everything from every lying scoundrel, and added it to his *Tafsīr* — which is held in high esteem by all Shī‘ah.¹ Al-Dhahabī and Ibn Ḥajar have said regarding this *Tafsīr* of his, “he has a *Tafsīr*, which contains calamities.”²

The extremist circles of the third century exerted themselves in trying to fabricate as many narrations regarding this as possible. This was to the extent that their scholar — al-Mufīd, who they refer to as *Rukn al-Islām wa Āyat Allah al-Malik al-‘Allām* (d. 413 A.H) —testifies that there are a great number of these narrations, according to the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah. He says:

إن الأخبار قد جاءت مستفيضة عن أئمة الهدى من آل محمد صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم باختلاف القرآن
وما أحدثه بعض الظالمين فيه من الحذف والنقصان

1 Refer to the preface of this book.

2 Refer to *Mīzān al-I‘tidāl* 3/111, *Lisān al-Mīzān* 4/191

There is a great number of narrations from the Imāms of guidance from the progeny of Muḥammad ﷺ regarding the alterations of the Qur'ān, and that which some of the oppressors done to it as far as adding and removing is concerned.¹

This abundance is the result of the lies and fabrications against the Ahl al-Bayt, which reached a high level at the hands of a bunch of their scholars, in the third century. If the Ahl al-Bayt had anything, they would have recited it, leaving out everything else and they would have brought it out to the public. They would not be allowed to hide it. However, the Ahl al-Bayt, according to the confession of the Shī'ah, did not recite anything besides the Book of Allah. Thus their innocence from this lie has become clear. A religion which contains a great number of falsehood is itself nothing but falsehood!

Nevertheless, al-Mufīd says that this kufr is wide-spread between his people, even though his teacher, Ibn Bābawayh says (as quoted previously):

إن من نسب إلى الشيعة مثل هذا القول فهو كاذب

Whoever attributes to the Shī'ah a statement like this is a liar.

The “descendant of the Ahl al-Bayt”, al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, who was a contemporary of al-Mufīd and a student of his, says, “their narrations on this subject cannot be paid attention to, as they are unreliable. That which is known and its authenticity is undoubted cannot be rejected by means of their likes.”² Do each of these scholars invent their own school of thought and group, with the common factor between them being that they are Shī'ah? Or do they switch colours like chameleons, as a result of Taqiyyah? A third possibility is that they wish to maintain, according to the time and place, two contradictory views so that none may understand the exact position of their religion.

1 *Awā'il al-Maqālāt* pg. 98

2 *Majma' al-Bayān* 10/31

This is why we find that in the sixth century, al-Ṭabarsī (the author of the famous *Tafsīr*) rejected this view, as will appear, whereas his contemporary, the other al-Ṭabarsī (author of *al-Ihtijāj*) openly declared this kufr, and he quoted tens of narrations regarding it, understanding his view to be that upon which consensus took place, or at least it is well known among the adherents of his religion, as explained. A fourth possibility is that these narrations were only fabricated in the latter days, but they were attributed to the classical scholars to win the support of the gullible followers.

The question of all of this being Taqiyyah will be dealt with soon, if Allah wills. Anyway, the production or fabrication of these narrations during the Safavid reign increased manifold. It even surpassed that which was done by al-Qummī, al-Kulaynī, al-Mufīd, Furāt al-Kūfī and the other Shīʿī scholars of the third and fourth century, to the extent that their scholar, al-Majlisī (author of *Biḥār al-Anwār*) testified that their narrations regarding this are now equivalent to the narrations of Imāmāh. He says:

وعندي أن الأخبار في هذا الباب متواترة معنى، وطرح جميعها يوجب رفع الاعتماد عن الأخبار رأساً؛ بل ظني أن الأخبار في هذا الباب لا تقصر عن أخبار الإمامة

According to me, the narrations regarding this are mutawātir as far as the meaning is concerned. Rejecting every single one of them would destroy any reliance upon the narrations. In fact, I think that the narrations regarding this are not less than the narrations regarding Imāmāh.¹

This is a testament from al-Majlisī who expired in the year 1111 A.H, stating that the narrations regarding this are of a great number, whereas only two of these narrations could be found in the book of *Sulaym ibn Qays* and according to Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (d. 381 A.H), they were almost non-existent. He stated:

إن من نسب للشيعة مثل هذا القول فهو كاذب، وشيخ الشيعة الطوسي أنكر نسبة هذا إلى الشيعة

1 *Mir'āt al-'Uqūl* 2/536

Undoubtedly, the one who attributes the likes of this to the Shī'ah is a liar. The scholar of the Shī'ah, al-Ṭūsī, rejected that this could be attributed to the Shī'ah.¹

Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī really exerted himself to find a way around the statement of al-Ṭūsī. He said:

والطوسي في إنكاره (يعني لتحريف القرآن) معذور لقلة تتبعه الناشئ من قلة تلك الكتب عنده

Al-Ṭūsī, in his rejection (of the belief of alteration taking place) is excused, as he did not research this adequately. This was due to him not having many of those books in his possession.²

This excuse cannot be accepted from the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, who insists on bringing all the Shī'ah onto his view (that the Qur'ān was altered). This is because al-Ṭūsī was the scholar of the Shī'ah in his era, and he was the author of two of their four canonical books on ḥadīth, and two of them relied upon books on narrators. How then can it be imagined that he could be excused for not having done enough research or not having enough books, as claimed by al-Ṭabarsī?

We, on the other hand would like to establish from this statement of al-Ṭūsī an important testimony and a historic record which establishes that this lie was not widespread and it did not reach the level that it presently stands on except under the supervision of the Safavid dynasty. It is not far-fetched at all that they added on and attributed these fabrications to their classical scholars, in an effort to promote it. This possibility is strengthened by the fact that there is no shortage of evidence to prove that lies are the norm among the Shī'ah. This is well established by the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah and it is corroborated by the books of the Shī'ah as well, as will appear shortly.³

1 *Tafsīr al-Tibyān* 1/3

2 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* scroll 175 (of the manuscript)

3 Refer to the chapter, "their beliefs regarding the Sunnah".

There is an abundance of testimonies from the scholars of the Safavid dynasty stating that there are many narrations like this. Just as al-Majlisī testified, similarly, their other scholar, Ni‘mat Allāh al-Jazā’irī (who was a contemporary of al-Majlisī and a student of his, and reliable and trustworthy scholar according to them) also testified regarding the same.¹ He says:

إن الأخبار الدالة على ذلك تزيد على ألفي حديث

The narrations which point that out are more than two thousand aḥādīth.²

He goes on to say, whilst placing the Qur’ān on one pan of the scale, that to proclaim that the Qur’ān was unadulterated would strip the narrations of all credibility. Thus, he says whilst rebutting the classical scholars who proclaimed that the seven qirā’āh are mutawātir:

إن تسليم تواترها عن الوحي الإلهي، وكون الكل قد نزل به الروح الأمين يفضي إلى طرح الأخبار المستفيضة، بل المتواترة الدالة بصريحتها على وقوع التحريف في القرآن

To accept that it is mutawātir, from the revelation of Allah, and that al-Rūḥ al-Amīn (Jibrīl) brought it, leads to discarding the *mustafīd* (reported by multiple reliable narrators) narrations. In fact it leads to the rejection of the mutawātir which point out very clearly that alterations took place in the Qur’ān.³

In other words, it is more important to uphold the veracity and integrity of his narrations than the Qur’ān! This is exactly what their scholar al-Majlisī stated when he said, “rejecting every single one of them would destroy any reliance upon the narrations,” as quoted above. This is the tough decision that these fraudsters have to make; do they lose their narrations, upon which their religion

1 This was pointed out to by him in *Al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah* 4/232

2 Refer to *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* scroll 125 (of the manuscript) and pg. 251 of the printed edition.

3 *Al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah* 2/356-357

stands and by means of which their sustenance is attained (in the name of khums) and their sacredness is upheld (as they claim to be deputies of the Imām). Do they lose all these benefits that are accrued by means of it or should they say that the Qur'ān was altered, the result of which will be that the Muslims will declare them disbelievers, their religion will hardly attract anyone thereafter, their followers will dwindle and the avenues of income will diminish. Indeed it is a tough decision for these (scholars)! Should they appear before the public holding two contradictory views, should they hide and do taqiyyah or should they act according to the demand of the moment?

What has been noticed is that the scholars of the Safavid dynasty were bolder in stating their kufr as a result of some power upon which they could rely. Consequently, the act of Taqiyyah was, to an extent, neglected by them. This is why there are many statements made by them stating that this kufr is established by them with tawātur. Their scholar, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sharīf (who is a student of al-Majlisī) claimed:

يمكن الحكم بكونه من ضروريات مذهب التشيع

It is possible to say that it is from the fundamentals of the Shī'ī religion.¹

Their reliable scholar, Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-Māzindarānī (d. 1081 A.H.) says:

.. وإسقاط بعض القرآن وتحريفه ثبت من طرقنا بالتواتر معنى كما يظهر لمن تأمل كتب الأحاديث (يعني كتب أحاديثهم) من أولها إلى آخرها

The deletion of a portion of the Qur'ān and its alteration is established from our narrations with tawātur as far as the meaning is concerned, as is apparent for the one who ponders over the books of aḥādīth (i.e. Shī'ī books of ḥadīth) from the start to the end.²

1 *Mir'āt al-Anwār* pg. 49

2 *Al-Māzindarānī: Sharḥ al-jāmi'* (of *al-Kāfi*) 11/76

Their scholar, Muḥsin al-Kāshānī says:

المستفاد... من الروايات من طريق أهل البيت - عليهم السلام - أن القرآن الذي بين أظهرنا ليس بتمامه، كما أنزل على محمد صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم، بل منه ما هو خلاف ما أنزل الله، ومنه ما هو مغير محرف، وأنه قد حذف عنه أشياء كثيرة منها اسم علي - عليه السلام - في كثير من المواضع، ومنها غير ذلك، وأنه ليس أيضاً على الترتيب المرضي عند الله وعند رسوله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم

What is understood from the narrations of the Ahl al-Bayt عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام is that the Qur'ān which is before us is not complete, in the form that it was revealed upon Muḥammad ﷺ. Rather, some of it is against that which Allah revealed and some of it is changed and altered. Many things have been deleted therefrom, including the name of 'Alī عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام from many places, among other things. It is also not according to the sequence that Allah and His Rasūl ﷺ were pleased with.¹

These are some of the statements of the scholars of the Safavid era regarding the amount of narrations on the subject. These statements are destructive testimonies, which establish that these lies and fabrications are upheld by them and they appear in many places in their books. This, most certainly, proves the falsity of all their narrations. As long as lies and fabrications are reported, according to them, with tawātur, there can be no reliance upon any of their narrations. Whoever inclines towards these beliefs has nothing to do with the religion of Islam.

The religion of these people is the religion of Imāms, or rather, the religion of al-Majlisī, al-Qummī, al-Kulaynī, al-'Ayyāshī, etc. They are just like all the other irreligious sects who existed along the course of Islamic history. The veil which they used to hide their reality and enmity towards Islam has been ripped to pieces by this claim, and their hundreds of narrations, which they falsely attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt, have been exposed to be lies and deception by means of this open kufr.

Due to the continuous efforts to produce fabrications along the centuries, especially in the era of the Safavids, we see the leading scholar of the Shī'ah,

1 *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/49

their ḥadīth expert, the expert on the science of (their) narrators, the author of their final ḥadīth compilation (*Mustadrak al-Wasā'il*) and the teacher of many of their reliable scholars (including Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā and Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭehrānī) — Ḥusayn al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī saying that it is inappropriate to study the chains of this fabrication, as it is reported with tawātur by their narrators. His exact words are:

إن ملاحظة السند في تلك الأخبار الكثيرة توجب سد باب التواتر المعنوي فيها بل هو أشبه بالسواس
الذي ينبغي الاستعاذة منه

Studying the chains of those narrations, which are abundant in number necessitates that tawātur as far as the meaning is concerned should be shunned. In fact, it is quite similar to waswās (whisperings of the devil), from which protection should be sought.¹

Al-Khūṭī, the Marja' of the Shī'ah in Iraq, as well as others today, says:

إن كثرة الرويات (رواياتهم في تحريف القرآن) من طريق أهل البيت تورث القطع بصدور بعضها عن
المعصومين، ولا أقل من الاطمئنان بذلك، وفيها ما روي بطريق معتبر

The abundance of narrations (of their regarding this) from the narrators of the Ahl al-Bayt demands certainty that at least some were stated by the infallibles. The bare minimum is that there is satisfaction (that these fabrications are established) due to that. Many of them are reported through authentic chains.²

After all these confessions from the luminaries of the Shī'ah, will anyone doubt that these people have fallen into this murky quagmire and dark abyss? How much of pain do they not bring to the heart of a Muslim? Will he not take pity upon a people who rely, in their religious matters, upon books which are laden with this filth and upon 'scholars' (who sold their souls to the devil and placed their forelocks in his hand) who openly state this kufr? However, one question

1 Faṣl al-Khiṭāb scroll 124 (of the manuscript)

2 Al-Khūṭī: *al-Bayān* pg. 226

remains; is this the belief of all the Shī'ah? Do all of them subscribe to this kufr? This will be discussed in the next few paragraphs.

Do All Shī'ah Believe in the Authenticity of these Narrations and Regard them to be Mutawātir?

After our presentation of some of the contents of these narrations which further clarified the reality, our attempt to ascertain the amount of their narrations and the weight of their chains, seeing that most of the Shī'ī books have fallen into this dark abyss and after seeing that the engineers of Shī'ism worked hard in trying to fabricate and increase these narrations along the course of the centuries, to the extent that their reliable scholars claimed them to be mutawātir and mustafīḍ and that their chains should not be studied, the question that remains is: do all the scholars of the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah agree with them regarding this?

Al-Mufīd (d. 413 A.H.) states in his book *Awā'il al-Maqālāt*, which is among their reliable books (as stated by their present-day scholars¹):

واتفقوا - أي الإمامية - على أن أئمة الضلال خالفوا في كثير من تأليف القرآن وعدلوا فيه عن موجب التنزيل وسنة النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم، وأجمعت المعتزلة، والخوارج، والزيدية، والمرجئة، وأصحاب الحديث على خلاف الإمامية

They (the Imāmiyyah) were unanimous that the Imāms of misguidance opposed greatly, the sequence of the Qur'ān and they turned away in it from the demands of the revelation and the Sunnah of Nabī ﷺ. The Mu'tazilah, Khawārij, Zaydiyyah, Murji'ah and people of ḥadīth have all agreed to oppose the Imāmiyyah.²

This is an important testimony and an explicit admission by al-Mufīd of the Shī'ah that the rest of the sects of Islam did not fall into the kufr that he and his sect fell into. It is a testimony that silences those Rawāfiḍ who try — in a cowardly manner — to silence the Ahl al-Sunnah on the topic of this fabrication, by falsely

1 Muḥammad Jawād Mughniyah: *al-Shī'ah fī l-Mizān* pg. 14

2 *Awā'il al-Maqālāt* pg. 13

attempting to attribute this lie to them, an attempt that is clearly a hopeless plot. The Ahl al-Sunnah are not in need of this testimony to prove their innocence. However, we have mentioned it here as it is the word of the opposition, whose word holds more weight, when he speaks the truth, than the word of a friend. It also serves the purpose of silencing the lying disbelievers.

He also admits that his sect is unanimous upon this open kufr. He did not mention any difference of opinion among their scholars regarding this, even though his teacher, Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (who is referred to as al-ṣadūq by them (d. 381 A.H.)) rejected this in his book *Al-I'tiqādāt*.¹ He was also displeased with the attribution of the belief that alterations took place to his sect, as explained. The same was said by al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā² (d. 436 A.H.), al-Ṭūsī³ (450 A.H.) (both of whom were students of al-Mufīd) and al-Ṭabarsī (d. 548 A.H. or 561 A.H.).

Why did al-Mufīd not indicate towards the view of his teacher, al-Qummī? Did he ignore it on account of him being satisfied that it was done out of Taqiyyah? Added to that, this very Mufīd, in this very book of his, mentioned that a group from the Imāmiyyah have rejected this view.⁴ Similar to the claim of al-Mufīd is the claim of al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, who claimed that the Shī'ah unanimously believed in this kufr, until the appearance of Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, who then opposed them. He says:

إن ابن بابويه القمي أول من أحدث هذا القول في الشيعة في عقائده

Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī was the first one to introduce this view to the Shī'ah, in his (book on) beliefs.⁵

1 *Al-I'tiqādāt* pg. 101-102

2 Refer to *al-Tibyān* 1/3, *Majma' al-Bayān* 1/31

3 *Al-Tibyān* 1/3

4 He mentions that a group from the Imāmiyyah state, "there was no deletion of any word, verse or surah." Refer to *Awā'il al-Maqlāt* pg. 55. Their inconsistency regarding the matter of *ijmā'* will be seen under the discussion, "their beliefs regarding *ijmā'* (consensus)". They have a consensus which is contradicted by another consensus. At times one of them will claim that consensus took place, yet he will state that there was a difference of opinion.

5 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, scroll 111 (of the manuscript)

Perhaps the reader realised the effort made by this al-Ṭabarsī to establish that the Shī'ah, from their inception, held his view, and that opposition of his view was something that happened later. The reality that no Muslim will argue regarding, and no person who studied the development of Shī'ī doctrine will doubt, is that the initial Shī'ah had nothing to do with this kufr. Shī'ism, in its initial stage, was concerning nothing more than Imāmah and who was most deserving of it.

Thereafter, one innovation led to another, in quick succession. Thus by the third century, we see their scholars competing with one another in upholding this kufr. This brought upon them humiliation, disgust and contempt from the Muslims. Hence, Ibn Bābawayh attempted to take them back to their original beliefs, as it seems. However, the doctrine of Taqiyyah destroyed the fruits of Ibn Bābawayh's efforts. He was nonetheless followed by three of their scholars, as explained earlier. Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī mentions that from the fourth century right up until the sixth century, a fifth person could not be added to this list. He says:

لم يعرف الخلاف صريحاً إلا من هؤلاء الأربعة

No explicit difference of opinion was known, except from these four.¹

Thus, after this idea found its way into the Shī'ī religion, none of their scholars were found to openly condemn it besides these four.² We have indicated previously

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* 15 (of the manuscript) and pg. 24 of the printed version.

2 Shaykh Iḥsān Ilāhī Ṣahīr, after quoting this statement, challenged the Shī'ah to bring forth a fifth person. Refer to *al-Shī'ah wa l-Sunnah* pg. 124. However, regarding this matter, it is necessary to keep in mind the following:

- Firstly, al-Mufid mentioned that a group of the Imāmiyyah have opposed this view. Refer to *Awā'il al-Maqālāt* pg. 55. Here, is he referring to the difference of these three (as al-Ṭabarsī only appeared in the sixth century) or were there more individuals (especially since he describes them as a 'group', which is indicative of them being many in number), to whom he is referring to? The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* himself was unsure regarding this. He said:

ولم يعرف من القدماء موافق لهم إلا ما حكاه المفيد من جماعة من أهل الإمامة، والظاهر أنه أراد منها الصدوق وأتباعه

None of the classical (Shī'ah) are known to have agreed with them, except that which is reported by al-Mufid from group of the people of Imāmah. Apparently, it seems as if he was referring to al-Ṣadūq and his followers. (*Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 33).

that Ibn Ḥazm mentions that all of the Imāmiyyah were upon this falsehood besides three of them, among who was al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā. Their scholars have stated that the Imāmiyyah were not unanimous regarding this kufr. The author of *Qawāmi' al-Fuṣūl* says:

إن المحكي عن ظاهر الكليني وشيخه علي بن إبراهيم القمي والشيخ أحمد بن أبي طالب الطبرسي صاحب الاحتجاج وقوع التحريف والزيادة والنقصان فيه، بل وحكي ذلك عن أكثر الأخباريين، وعن السيد الصدوق والمحقق إنكار ذلك، بل وحكي عن جمهور المجتهدين، وظاهر الصدوق في اعتقاداته أن المراد بما ورد في الأخبار الدالة على أن في القرآن الذي جمعه أمير المؤمنين - رضي الله عنه - كان زيادة لم يكن في غيرها أنها كانت من باب الأحاديث القدسية لا القرآن

That which is reported from the apparent (text) of al-Kulaynī, his teacher, ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī and Shaykh Aḥmad ibn Abī Ṭālib al-Ṭabarsī (the author of *al-Iḥtijāj*) is that alterations, additions and deletions took place in it. In fact, that has been reported from most of the Akhbārīs. It is reported from al-Sayyid al-Ṣaduq,¹ and al-Muḥaqqiq² that they have rejected it, just as this is reported from most of the Mujtahids. The apparent meaning of al-Ṣadūq’s statement in his *I’tiqādāt* is that the purport of all the narrations which indicate that the Qur’ān which was gathered by Amīr al-Mu’minīn عليه السلام had additional (information), that was not in the rest was the al-Aḥādīth al-Qudsiyyah, not the Qur’ān.³

continued from page 374

- Secondly, the belief of all the initial Shī’ah was contrary to this kufr. A group of irreligious ones, who infiltrated the ranks of the Shī’ah are the ones who are responsible for this belief. Thus, the statement of al-Nūrī, “none of the classical (Shī’ah) are known to have agreed with them,” is a blatant lie. In fact, all of the initial Shī’ah were in agreement with them.
- Thirdly, al-Ash’arī, in *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn*, attributes rejection of this kufr to a group of them. This indicates that they were more than three. Refer to *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/119/120.

1 A title of Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, the author of *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh*.

2 The title *al-Muḥaqqiq* (the researcher) is used to refer to Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī and Ja’far ibn Ḥasan ibn Yaḥyā (d. 676 A.H.) Refer to Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭehrānī: *al-Anwār al-Sāṭi’ah* pg. 164. Here, it is being used to refer to al-Ṭūsī.

3 *Qawāmi' al-Fuṣūl* pg. 298

Al-Ṭabarsī has also indicated towards the above in *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, and he mentioned the names of many of those who believed that alterations took place. Among his statements are:

اعلم أن لهم في ذلك أقوالاً مشهورها اثنان: الأول وقع التغيير والنقصان فيه

Know that they have many views regarding that, but two of them are popular; the first is that alterations and deletions took place...

Thereafter, he goes on to mention the names of their scholars who were of this view, quoting some of them on the matter. It should be noted that he tries to exaggerate, by adding most of the scholars of this sect to this list. He even goes as far as listing books which neither existed, nor is there any trace of them. Among them are the books he refers to as “*al-Taḥrīf*” (alterations) and “*al-Tabdīl*” (the change), the authors of which, he implies, held the same view as him.¹

His opposition may ask, “why rule out the possibility that these books were written to criticise the Shīʿī misinterpretations of the Qurʾān, or their claim that the words were altered? The name could imply that as well.” Thereafter, he mentions the second view:

الثاني: عدم وقوع التغيير والنقصان فيه وأن جميع ما نزل على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله هو الموجود بأيدي الناس فيما بين الدفتين، وإليه ذهب الصدوق في عقائده والسيد المرتضى، وشيخ الطائفة في التبيان، ولم يعرف من القدماء موافق لهم إلا ما حكاه المفيد عن جماعة من أهل الإمامة، والظاهر أنه أراد منها الصدوق وأتباعه

The second view is that alterations and deletions did not take place, and whatever Allah revealed to Rasūlullāh ﷺ is found among the people, between the two covers. This is the view stated by al-Ṣadūq in his (book on) beliefs, al-Sayyid al-Murtaḍā and Shaykh al-Ṭāʾifāh in al-Tibyān. None of the classical (Shīʿah) are known to have agreed with them, except that which is reported by al-Mufid from group of the people of Imāmāh. Apparently, it seems as if he was referring to al-Ṣadūq and his followers.²

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* 30-31

2 Ibid pg. 33

His statement, “none of the classical (Shī'ah) are known to have agreed with them,” is with reference to his Imāmiyyah and Rāfiḍah scholars. It cannot refer to the initial Shī'ah, as they did not stoop to this level. Thereafter, this al-Nūrī says:

ثم شاع هذا المذهب (يعني إنكار التحريف) بين الأصوليين من أصحابنا واشتهر بينهم حتى قال المحقق
الكاظمي في شرح الوافية: إنه حكى عليه الإجماع

Then this view spread (rejection of the view that alterations took place) among our companions from the Uṣūlīs and it became famous amongst them to the extent that al-Muḥaqqiq al-Kāẓimī stated in *Sharḥ al-Wāfiyah*, “Ijmā' has been reported regarding this.”¹

He then tries to reject this ijmā', so that he could claim that most of the Shī'ah held the same view as him. Now, do we believe that the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah are not unanimous upon this kufr, but rather they have two views regarding the matter, as indicated to by al-Ash'arī in his *Maqālāt*? Or, do we say that there is only one view and whoever rejected it, did so whilst practising Taqiyyah? This will be discussed next.

Do those who Reject this Kufr (from the Shī'ah) do so on Account of Taqiyyah?

Although we explained that the Imāmiyyah were not unanimous upon this kufr, and that senior research scholars among them, such as al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, al-Ṭūsī, al-Ṭabarsī and others who follow them from the latter day scholars have rejected it, a cry was made by the scholars of the Safavid dynasty that any rejection of this view that took place, was done out of Taqiyyah. Their scholar, Ni'mat Allāh al-Jazā'irī (who belonged to the Akhbārīs²), regarding whom al-Khowansārī said:

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 38

2 This is why al-Khowansārī said, “despite him being from the Akhbāriyyah, he had a strong relationship with the masters of ijtihād.” *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 8/150

كان من أعظم علمائنا المتأخرين وأفخم فضلائنا المتبحرين..

He was from the greatest of our latter day scholars and from the most outstanding of our accomplished well-read ones.¹

He (al-Jazā'irī) says:

والظاهر أن هذا القول إنما صدر منهم لأجل مصالح كثيرة، منها سد باب الطعن عليهم بأنه إذا جاز هذا في القرآن فكيف جاز العمل بقواعده وأحكامه مع جواز لحوق التحريف لها

It seems as if this was only said by them on account of the many benefits thereof. Among the benefits was that they closed the door to the objection that if this was possible regarding the Qur'ān, then how can it be correct to practise upon its laws and regulations, as it is possible that they were changed?²

Thereafter, he presents proof for his statement saying:

كيف وهؤلاء الأعلام رويوا في مؤلفاتهم أخباراً تشتمل على وقوع تلك الأمور في القرآن، وأن الآية هكذا أنزلت ثم غيرت إلى هذا

How is it possible (to reject the view) when these luminaries reported in their books such narrations which include (accounts) of those matters taking place in the Qur'ān, and that a verse was revealed in this manner but then it was changed to that.³

The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* holds the same view. He quotes the above-quoted speech of al-Jazā'irī in support of his view, just as he quotes the view of their scholar, Ibn Tāwūs, who says that the book al-Tibyān was written with extreme caution and it is the pinnacle of compromising for the sake of the opposition.⁴ We have quoted his statement previously. Is the reality as stated by these people?

1 *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 8/150

2 Al-Jazā'irī: *Al-Anwār al-Nu'māniyyah* 2/358

3 *Ibid* 2/358-359

4 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 38 (of the manuscript)

I say, there is no doubt that al-Jazā'irī, the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* and others are among those who openly state this kufr. Whoever does so, is quite clearly out of the fold of Islam. If we were instructed to ascertain the truth of the statements of sinners, then what can be said about the statements of these people? They are desperate to have every Shī'ī proclaiming this kufr. Thus, it is not at all surprising that they interpret the statements of their opposition as Taqiyyah. I believe that those who accept the word of this al-Jazā'irī and those who followed his footsteps, without any hesitation, and have pasted this kufr upon every member of this sect without ascertaining and studying the reality, have erred.

If we do not accept the speech of these liars, this does not mean that we will gullibly accept and take at face value (without questioning) the statements of the opposition. This is especially since we know that Taqiyyah is one of their principles, it makes up nine tenths of their religion and (according to them) there is no religion for the one who does not practise Taqiyyah, as will be proven.

Hence, it is absolutely necessary to do a careful, objective and composed study of this matter. thus, I say, just as al-Mufīd reports that his sect were unanimous regarding this kufr (as explained), many of their senior latter day scholars reported that the Uṣūlī Shī'ah unanimously rejected this kufr.¹ The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* admitted that the view of rejecting that any alterations took place had spread and become famous among his companions. He says:

”.. شاع هذا المذهب بين الأصوليين من أصحابنا واشتهر بينهم حتى قال المحقق الكاظمي في شرح الوافية: إنه حكى عليه الإجماع

This view spread (rejection of the view that alterations took place) among our companions from the Uṣūlīs and it became famous amongst them to the extent that al-Muḥaqqiq al-Kāẓimī stated in *Sharḥ al-Wāfiyah*, “ijmā' has been reported regarding this.”²

1 Ibid pg. 38 (of the manuscript)

2 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 38

The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* was angered by this. This is because, like I explained, he wishes to portray his view as the most famous one and the view of the majority. He says:

إن دعواه - يعني دعوى الإجماع - جرة عظيمة (!) وكيف يمكن دعوى الإجماع بل الشهرة المطلقة على مسألة خالفها جمهور القدماء وجل المحدثين وأساطين المتأخرين، بل رأينا كثيراً من كتب الأصول خالية عن ذكر هذه المسألة، ولعل المتتبع يجد صدق ما قلناه، ومع ذلك كله فالمتتبع هو الدليل، وإن لم يذهب إليه إلا قليل كما قال السيد المرتضى - رحمه الله - في بعض مسائله: لا يجب أن يوحش من المذهب قلة المذهب إليه والعائر عليه، بل ينبغي ألا يوحش منه إلا ما لا دلالة له تعضده ولا حجة تعمده، وقال المفيد في موضع من المقالات: ولم يوحشني من خالف فيه؛ إذ بالحجة له أتم أنس ولا وحشة من حق

His claim (of *ijmā'*) is extremely bold! How can *ijmā'* be claimed regarding something that was opposed by the majority of the former (scholars), most of the *ḥadīth* scholars and the luminaries of the historians? This cannot even be classified as famous! Rather, we have seen that most of the books of *uṣūl* (principles) do not mention anything on the subject. The one who studies will perhaps see the truth of our speech. Nonetheless, that which should be followed is proof, even if it is only followed by a few, as al-Sayyid al-Murtaḍā, in some of his matters, stated, "a viewpoint should not be feared on account of the fact that only a few uphold it and are aware of it. Rather, only that should be feared, which is not backed by any proof and is not based on any evidence." Al-Mufīd stated in one place of *al-Maqālāt*, "it does bother me who opposes this view. Complete serenity is found where there is proof, and there can be no fear of the truth."¹

In the above, we see the snippets of an argument that raged between the two groups, with each claiming that his view is the correct and popular one. Then we see this man, cladding himself in the attire of an advisor (just as the devil does at times) and advising his people to the fire of Hell, which is indeed an abhorred abode! He also claims that his view is the one which is supported by proofs from their books. Claiming that the opposite view was famous or that there was unanimity regarding it, is according to him, great boldness.

1 Ibid pg. 38-39

Thus, there is no doubt that a group from among the Shī'ah, who had many followers, did not subscribe to this kufr. It was in response to them, as it seems, that the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* compiled his book, i.e. to refute the view upheld by them. He wished to lift from them the blindness that he believes enveloped them. This is why he says that proof should be followed, even if no one else followed it.

Perhaps, he felt lonely due to his view. Kufr has always been a lonely and frightening cave. He probably feared that his followers and supporters were about to diminish, due to which he began advising them not to feel lonely or be fearful on account of them being few. This, according to him was a sign of the truth regarding this matter. It is amazing that he supports his stance using the words of al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, who distanced himself from this kufr and declared those who subscribed to it kāfir. He uses the word of this very individual to invite his people towards heresy.

Along the course of my study of the book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, it became clear to me that a sect from the Shī'ah were not ready to accept this nonsense. The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* attacked them on various occasions. He comments on the speech of one of them saying:

ليس لداء قلة التتبع دواء إلا تعب المراجعة

There is no cure to the illness of insufficient research except tiring oneself in referring (to sources).¹

He was similarly irritated with by the matter of al-Ṣadūq, the author of *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* — one of their canonical works — due to him rejecting this lie. He says that the matter of al-Ṣadūq is confusing. He accuses him of distorting some narrations to support his view in rejecting this nonsense. He also states that he changed some of the narrations in a manner that creates suspicions regarding him.² The exact texts regarding this will appear shortly. It should be

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* page 84 of the manuscript and 169 of the printed version.

2 Ibid page 120 of the manuscript and 240 of the printed book.

kept in mind that his book, *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* is one of their most relied upon compilations.

At times, he presents excuses on behalf of his brethren who rejected this view, which he insists is proven and mutawātir (through their false narrations). He says:

إن أخبار التحريف متفرقة فلهذا لم يعرفوها

The narrations of *tahrīf* (interpolation) are spread out. Thus, they were not aware of them.¹

One may say, “they were unaware of them, as they did not exist. They were only invented later and they multiplied and increased. People like yourself then began accepting them, either on account of being fooled or because you wished to fool others. This is the only possibility, as it cannot be accepted that the likes of Ibn Bābawayh and others, who were the pioneers of your religion and the compliers of your most relied upon books were ignorant of this.” He presents a similar excuse on behalf of al-Ṭūsī (as will appear). Ni‘mat Allāh al-Jazā’irī, who claimed that they rejected the view on account of Taqiyyah, was not convinced regarding this. Hence, we see him, in *al-Ṣaḥīfah al-Sajjādiyyah* expressing his surprise at their actions. He tries to refute their proofs saying:

وأخبارنا متواترة بوقوع التحريف والسقط منه بحيث لا يسعنا إنكاره، والعجب العجيب من الصدوق وأمين الإسلام الطبرسي، والمرضى في بعض كتبه كيف أنكروه وزعموا أن ما أنزله الله تعالى هو هذا المكتوب مع أن فيه رد متواتر الأخبار

Our narrations regarding the occurrence of alterations and deletions are mutawātir. Thus, we cannot deny it. It is quite strange that al-Ṣadūq, Amīn al-Islām al-Ṭabarsī and al-Murtaḍā (in some of his books) rejected this and claimed that whatever Allah ﷻ revealed is this written (book), even though that would demand rejection of the mutawātir narrations (i.e. their tales).

1 Ibid page 176 of the manuscript.

Thereafter, he wishes to answer the objection raised by the intelligent ones from his sect, i.e. saying that the Qur'ān was altered demands that it should not be practised upon as it is unreliable, and this is against the view of the Shī'ah and the Imāms. His reply is:

وما قيل من طرفهم أنه يلزم عليه ارتفاع الموثوق بالآيات الأحكامية، ويتنفي جواز الاستدلال بها لمكان جواز التحريف عليها. فجوابه: أنهم عليهم السلام أمرونا في هذه الأعصار بتلاوة هذا القرآن والعمل بما تضمنته آياته لأنه زمن هدنة، فإذا قامت دولتهم وظهر القرآن كما أنزل الذي ألفه أمير المؤمنين بعد وفاة الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم وشده في ردائه وأتى إلى أبي بكر وعمر وهما في المسجد في جماعة من الناس فعرضه عليهم فقالوا: لا حاجة لنا في قرآنك ولا فيك عندنا من القرآن ما يكفينا. فقال: لن تروه بعد هذا اليوم حتى يقوم قائمنا. فعند ذلك يكون ذلك القرآن هو المتداول بين الناس مع أن ما وقع من التحريف في الآيات الأحكامية أظهره عليهم السلام، فيقوم الظن بأن ما لم يعرفونا تحريفه لم يكن فيه تحريف

The argument presented by them is that it (the belief that alterations took place) removes reliance upon the verses containing commandments. Thus it will no longer be permissible to use them as proofs, as they were possibly changed. The answer to that is, they (the Imāms) instructed us in these times to recite and practise upon this Qur'ān and that which its verses imply, as this is the era of compromise. When their state will be established the Qur'ān, as it was revealed, will appear. (This is the Qur'ān) which Amīr al-Mu'minīn compiled after the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, wrapped it in his cloth and presented it to Abū Bakr and 'Umar (who were sitting amongst a group in the masjid), whereupon they said, "we have no need for you or your Qur'ān. That which is with us, of the Qur'ān, is sufficient for us." He replied, "you will not see it after this day, until our qā'im appears." This is when that Qur'ān will become common among the people. Besides that, all the changes that took place in the verses of laws have been pointed out by the Imāms. Thus, we assume that whatever they did not point out, has not been changed.¹

After this, is it correct for anyone to claim with certainty that the rejection of these people was done purely on account of Taqiyyah? Undoubtedly, the

1 *Sharḥ al-Ṣaḥīfah al-Sajjādiyyah* pg. 43

difference of opinion that exists between them and the others from their sect is of a very severe kind. It is quite clear from that which the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* as well as others have written that there is definitely a great dispute.

However, we still need to study the proof presented by Nī'mat Allāh al-Jazā'irī in support of his claim that it was done out of Taqiyyah. His proof is:

رووا في مؤلفاتهم أخباراً تشتمل على وقوع تلك الأمور في القرآن، وأن الآية هكذا أنزلت ثم غيرت إلى هذا

How is it possible (to reject the view) when these luminaries reported in their books such narrations which include (accounts) of those matters taking place in the Qur'ān, and that a verse was revealed in this manner but then it was changed to that.¹

Is this the truth regarding those who rejected the view?

We will begin with Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, known as al-Ṣadūq (d. 381 A.H), regarding him to be the first one who criticised the extremists, and claimed that their view does not represent the Shī'ī creed. This, he stated in his book *Al-I'tiqādāt*.

Ibn Bābawayh and His Rejection of that which is Attributed to His Sect

He says:

اعتقادنا أن القرآن الذي أنزل الله تعالى على نبيه محمد وهو ما بين الدفتين وهو ما في أيدي الناس، وليس بأكثر من ذلك، ومبلغ سورة عند الناس مائة وأربعة عشر وعندنا أن الضحى وألم نشرح سورة واحدة، ومن نسب إلينا أنا نقول أنه أكثر من ذلك فهو كاذب

Our belief is that the Qur'ān that Allah ﷻ revealed upon his Nabī, Muḥammad, is that which is between the two covers, and it is in the possession of the people. It is nothing more than that. The amount

1 Al-Jazā'irī: *Al-Anwār al-Nu'māniyyah* 2/358-359

of sūrahs that it contains, according to the people, is one hundred and fourteen. According to us, al-Ḍuḥā and Alam Nashrah (the names of two sūrahs) are one surah. Whoever attributes to us that we say there is more to it, then he is a liar.

Thereafter, he proves his point by quoting the narrations regarding the rewards of reciting a sūrah from the Qur’ān and the rewards of completing the Qur’ān. He explains that this refutes the false claims. He states further:

بل نقول: إنه قد نزل من الوحي الذي ليس بقرآن ما لو جمع إلى القرآن لكان مبلغه مقدراً سبع عشرة ألف آية

Rather, we say, “revelation that was not part of the Qur’ān was revealed, and (its amount was so much that) if it had to be added to the Qur’ān, its total would be seventeen thousand verses.”

As proof for this, he cited some of the al-Aḥādīth al-Qudsiyyah (according to them). Thereafter, he says:

ومثل هذا كثير كله وحي ليس بقرآن، ولو كان قرآنًا لكان مقروناً به وموصولاً إليه غير مفصول عنه كما قال أمير المؤمنين لما جمعه، فلما جاء به فقال لهم: هذا كتاب الله ربكم كما أنزل على نبيكم لم يزد فيه حرف ولم ينقص منه حرف، فقالوا: لا حاجة لنا فيه، عندنا مثل الذي عندك. فأنصرف وهو يقول: فنبذوه وراء ظهورهم واشتروا به ثمناً قليلاً فبئس ما يشترون

There are many others like this. All of it is revelation, but it is not the Qur’ān. If it was part of the Qur’ān, it would have been joined to it and it would not have been separated from it, as Amīr al-Mu’minīn said when he compiled it. After he compiled it and presented it to them saying, “this is the Book of Allah, your Rabb. Neither has an alphabet been added to it, nor erased from it.” They replied, “we have no need for it. We have the same as that which you have.” Thereupon, he turned around saying, “they hurled it behind their backs, and bought in exchange of it a petty sum. How evil is that which they bought!”¹

1 Al-I’tiqādāt pg. 101-103

This is what was stated by Ibn Bābawayh. I have quoted it in its entirety, as the source from which it was quoted is scarce. Also, most of those who quote from him, Shī'ah or non-Shī'ah, only quote the beginning of his speech, which does not give a clear picture of the man's beliefs. Reflect upon the following regarding his statement:

Firstly, he believed that this was the view of all the Imāmiyyah Shī'ah. This is why the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* commented, after quoting this text:

وظاهر قوله: اعتقادنا، وقوله: نسب إلينا، اعتقاد الإمامية

The apparent meaning of his words, “our belief” and “attributed to us” is the belief of the Imāmiyyah.¹

Thereafter, he takes him to task for this saying:

وقد ذكر في هذا الكتاب ما لم يقل به غيره أو قال به قليل

He mentioned in this book, that which was not the view of others or it was the view of a handful.²

I have already stated that the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* was quite zealous in bringing all the Shī'ah into his camp.

Secondly, he declares al-Kulaynī, the author of *al-Kāfī*, his teacher, al-Qummī (the author of the *Tafsīr*), al-Nu'mānī (the author of *al-Ghaybah*) and others who openly state this belief and count it among Shī'ī beliefs to be liars in his statement, “whoever attributes to us that we say there is more to it, then he is a liar.” In fact, it is as if he does not even count them among the Shī'ah.

Thirdly, we do not find any indication from him towards a second view regarding the matter amongst them, contrary to that which is stated by al-Ash'arī and

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 33

2 Ibid pg. 33

others. It is as if he believes that those who hold any other view are not part of the Shī'ah, unless there is some Taqiyyah that is taking place.

Fourthly, his statement, “if it had to be added to the Qur’ān, its total would be seventeen thousand verses” seems to be an explanation of the narration of al-Kulaynī in which it is mentioned, “the Qur’ān which was brought to Muḥammad ﷺ by Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was seventeen thousand verses, and the Qur’ān, as it is famously known, is a little more than six thousand verses.” However, al-Kulaynī explicitly mentions, as you have seen, that they are from the Qur’ān, whilst Ibn Bābawayh clearly states that they are not from the Qur’ān, and he interpreted them to be from the al-Aḥādīth al-Qudsiyyah.

Fifthly, he was not completely emancipated, as you have seen, from the effects of the tale-like narrations regarding this topic, which remained in his brains. Thus, you see him almost contradicting that which he established by mentioning the last narration regarding ‘Alī’s presentation of the Qur’ān to the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, and their rejection thereof. His acceptance of this fairy tale does create room for suspicions that his rejection was done on the basis of Taqiyyah (as stated by some Shī’ī scholars as well as scholars from the Ahl al-Sunnah).

Nonetheless, he did not dare to say anything explicit regarding the Book of Allah. He intended to clear the reputation of his people from the shame that was attached to them. He also did not have the courage to counter his people by rejecting their narrations completely. We cannot say whether he could not cleanse himself completely from their poison, or whether he rejected their view on the basis of Taqiyyah, leaving signs of this in his speech. Allah alone knows the secrets of men.

Among the Shī'ah, there are those who assert that his rejection was purely on the basis of Taqiyyah, such as Ni‘mat Allāh al-Jazā’irī. However, no reliable proof is presented to support this assertion. They suffice upon the fact that he reported in his book narrations which say that a verse was revealed in a certain manner and then it was changed to something else. After going through some of the

books of Ibn Bābawayh, who is referred to as al-Ṣadūq by them, to find narrations regarding this fabrication, we find that from the narrations regarding this, he reports the incident of the irreligious one who posed questions to ‘Alī عليه السلام (as they allege), which we quoted earlier on.

This is the very same narration which is reported by their scholar, al-Ṭabarsī (of the sixth century) in his book *al-Iḥtijāj*.¹ In his version of the narration, there are nine places which indicate towards this kufr, as pointed out by al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī.² We find that this tale, when reported by their Ṣadūq in his *al-Towḥīd*, becomes free of all those statements which indicate towards the kufr of Taḥrīf.³ The question arises; was this tale built upon in the two centuries after Ibn Bābawayh, so that it could include this kufr, or did Ibn Bābawayh himself delete this portion? Whatever the case may be, it is clear that he was free from the filth of the narration which was carried in the narration of al-Ṭabarsī.

The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* could not decide as to what was the reason behind this taking place. He says:

وساق (يعني صدوقهم) الخبر مع نقصان كثير عما في الاحتجاج، منه ما يتعلق بنقصان القرآن وتغييره، إما لعدم الحاجة إليه كما يفعل ذلك كثيرًا، أو لعدم موافقته لمذهبه

He (al-Ṣadūq) reports the narration, leaving out a lot of that which is in *al-Iḥtijāj*. From it, is that which relates to the shortening and changing of the Qur’ān. This was either because there was no need for it, (as he does this quite often) or because it did not correspond to his beliefs.⁴

Why did he not consider the possibility that the narration of *al-Towḥīd* was the original narration, and the lies related to Taḥrīf were added later by the author of *al-Iḥtijāj* and others? This is a very likely possibility, especially since al-Ṣadūq

1 Refer to *al-Iḥtijāj* pg. 240

2 Al-Nūrī: *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 240

3 Refer to *al-Towḥīd* pg. 255

4 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 240

did not indicate that he deleted anything from the narration. The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* was really angered by al-Ṣadūq — as it seems — on account of this. He says, quoting from another scholar of theirs:

وبالجملة فأمر الصدوق مضطرب جداً، ولا يحصل من فتواه علم ولا ظن لا يحصل من فتاوى وأساطين المتأخرين وكذلك الحال في تصحيحه وترجيحه

In a nutshell, the matter of al-Ṣadūq is highly inconsistent. Neither can knowledge, nor any idea be attained from his verdict, which can be attained from the verdicts of the latter day luminaries. The same is the condition of his authentications and preferences.¹

Thereafter, he says:

وقد ذكر صاحب البحار حديثاً عنه في كتاب التوحيد... ثم قال: هذا الخبر مأخوذ من الكافي وفيه تغييرات عجيبة تورث سوء الظن بالصدوق

The author of *Al-Biḥār* mentioned a narration from him, which appeared in *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd*... this narration is taken from *al-Kāfī*, and it has such strange changes to it that they raise suspicions regarding al-Ṣadūq.²

All of this criticism simply because al-Ṣadūq did not report the kufr that was reported by the author of *al-Kāfī*. The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* quoted these ‘criticisms’ due to the fact that Ibn Bābawayh did not adopt the same view as him. However, all the books of al-Ṣadūq were not free of this profanity. In his book, *Thawāb al-A‘māl*, he quotes regarding the reward of reciting Sūrah al-Aḥzāb:

1 Ibid

2 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 240 Al-Majlisī says this regarding al-Ṣadūq despite the fact that they consider all of his books, besides four of them, to be “just as famous as the four books which have been the foundation along the course of the centuries.” *Al-Biḥār* 1/26. He reports from him, in his *Al-Biḥār* on seventeen occasions (including *Al-Biḥār* 1/73). Added to that, his book, *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* is one of their four seminal books. What is the secret behind this contradiction?

من كان كثير القراءة لسورة الأحزاب كان يوم القيامة في جوار رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم وأزواجه - إلى أن قال: - إن سورة الأحزاب فضحت نساء قريش من العرب وكانت أطول من سورة البقرة ولكن نقصوها وحرفوها

Whoever recites Sūrah al-Aḥzāb abundantly, he will be in the companionship of the Rasūl ﷺ and his wives on the Day of Qiyāmah... Sūrah al-Aḥzāb disgraced Arab women from the Quraysh and it was longer than Sūrah al-Baqarah, but they shortened it and changed it.¹

In the book *al-Khiṣāl*, he quotes the following:

يجيء يوم القيامة ثلاثة يشكون إلى الله عز وجل: المصحف، والمسجد، والعتره. يقول المصحف يا رب حرقوني ومزقوني

On the Day of Qiyāmah, three things will come and complain to Allah; the muṣḥaf (copy of the Qur’ān, the Maṣjid and the household (of Rasūl ﷺ), The muṣḥaf will say, “O my Rabb, they burnt me and tore me.”²

The word “حرفوني” (they changed me) appears in *Biḥār al-Anwār*³ and in the book of one of those⁴ who quoted this narration. Undoubtedly, it is a stronger indication of this kufr. However, it is contrary to that which is in the original book. A similar narration appears in *Kitāb al-Amālī* of his. Al-Ṣadūq reports a narration with his isnād from Ja’far al-Ṣādiq — from his father — from his fore-fathers رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ — from Rasūlullāh ﷺ:

اذكروا وقوفكم بين يدي الله.. فإنه لا بد سائلكم عما عملتم بالثقلين من بعدي: كتاب الله، وعترتي، فانظروا أن لا تقولوا: أما الكتاب فغيرنا وحرفنا

Remember your standing before Allah... He will most definitely ask you about that which you done to al-Thaqalayn, after me; the Book of Allah and

1 *Thawāb al-A’māl* pg. 139, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/50

2 *Al-Khiṣāl* 1/174-175

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/49

4 *Iḥsān Ilāhī Zahrī: al-Shī’ah wa l-Qur’ān* pg. 68

my household. Thus, be careful that you should not end up saying, “as for the Book, we changed and altered it.”¹

This narration does not indicate towards any person’s actions, it is only a warning. However, if it is joined to that which precedes it, that they did do it (as these people claim), then it will be kufr. There are other similar narrations which were reported by the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* from secondary sources. I will not quote them, as I did not come across them in the books of al-Ṣadūq.² Also, there were some narrations regarding authentic recitals³ that were quoted by the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* from the books of al-Ṣadūq — the words of this man cannot be taken without double checking, it is not surprising that he did something like this — which are not in the original books. However, some writers from the Ahl al-Sunnah were fooled by this act of his and they followed suit, without thinking twice.⁴

1 *Amāmlī al-Ṣadūq* pg. 231

2 One example is that which he quotes from Bashārat al-Muṣṭafā of al-Ṣadūq, which is taken from *Tafsīr al-Burhān* by their ḥadīth scholar, al-Tūbalī. *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 157-158

3 Such as the three narrations quoted by the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* (pg. 259) from *Ma’ānī al-Akḥbār* (refer to *Ma’ānī al-Akḥbār* pg. 331) that the copies of ‘Ā’ishah and Ḥafṣah عليهما السلام stated:

حافظوا على الصلوات والصلوة الوسطى وصلاة العصر

Maintain with care the [obligatory] prayers and [in particular] the middle prayer and the prayer of ‘Aṣr.

This is a valid manner of recital. Refer, regarding its appearance in the copy of ‘Ā’ishah عليها السلام to *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 5/173, number 5393, 5394, 5397, 5466, 5467 (with the research of Aḥmad and Maḥmūd Shākir). Refer also to *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 1/304. Shaykh Aḥmad Shākir says, “the narration was reported by al-Ḥāfiẓ in *al-Fath* 8/146 and al-Süyūṭī 1/304. They did not attribute it to anyone besides al-Ṭabarī. Ibn Ḥazm mentioned it in *al-Muḥallā* 4/354 and ‘Abd al-Razzāq reported it in *al-Muṣannaf* 1/128.” *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* vol. 5 pg. 176 (footnote). Regarding the existence of this qirā’ah in the copy of Ḥafṣah عليها السلام, refer to *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 5/209, 210, number 5406, 5462, 5463. *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 1/304.

Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim contains that which indicates that the recital of this was abrogated. Refer to *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 1/438 Kitāb al-Masājīd wa Mawāḍi’ al-Ṣalāh, Bāb al-Dalīl liman Qāl al-Ṣalāt al-Wuṣṭā hiya al-Ṣalāt al-Wuṣṭā hiya al-Asr.

4 Refer to Iḥṣān Ilāhī Ṣaḥīḥ: *al-Shī’ah wa l-Qur’ān* pg. 96, Muḥammad Māl Allāh: *al-Shī’ah wa Taḥrīf al-Qur’ān* pg. 122

This brings us to the conclusion that some of the books of al-ṣadūq contain narrations regarding this fabrication. Despite that, we cannot be certain that he upheld this belief, and his rejection was merely Taqiyyah, as stated by some of them. This is because his books were not safe from additions and forgeries. We are not speaking on the basis of our imagination. Rather, additions and forgeries are considered trivial by these people, as is apparent from the book *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays*. As stated previously, many of their scholars have admitted that it contained fabrications and it was changed. Similarly, more than half of the book *Man lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* of Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī is made up of their additions, as will appear under the chapter, “their beliefs regarding the Sunnah”.

Al-Ṭūsī and His Rejection of Taḥrīf

As for their scholar, al-Ṭūsī (d. 450 A.H.), he says:

وأما الكلام في زيادته ونقصانه مما لا يليق به أيضاً؛ لأن الزيادة فيه مجمع على بطلانها، والنقصان منه فالظاهر أيضاً من مذهب المسلمين خلافه وهو الأليق بالصحيح من مذهبننا، ورويت روايات كثيرة من جهة العامة والخاصة بنقصان كثير من آي القرآن ونقل شيء منه من موضع إلى موضع، لكن طريقها الأحاد التي لا توجب علماً، فالأولى الإعراض عنها، وترك التشاغل بها، لأنه يمكن تأويلها، ولو صحت لما كان ذلك طعناً على ما هو موجود بين الدفتين، فإن ذلك معلوم صحته لا يعترضه أحد من الأئمة ولا يدفعه، ورواياتنا متناصرة بالبحث على قراءته والتمسك بما فيه ورد ما يرد من اختلاف الأخبار في الفروع إليه وعرضها عليه، فما وافقه عمل عليه، وما يخالفه يجتنب ولم يتلفت إليه، وقد وردت عن النبي صلى الله عليه وآله رواية لا يدفعها أحد أنه قال: إني مخلف فيكم الثقلين: كتاب الله وعترتي أهل بيتي، وإنهما لن يفترقا حتى يردا علي الحوض، وهذا يدل على أنه موجود في كل عصر، لأنه لا يجوز أن يأمر الأمة بالتمسك بما لا تقدر على التمسك به، كما أن أهل البيت ومن يجب اتباع قوله حاصل في كل وقت، وإذا كان الموجود بيننا مجمعة على صحته فينبغي أن نتشاغل بتفسيره وبيان معانيه وترك ما سواه

As for the discussion concerning whether addition or deletions took place in it, this is inappropriate. It is agreed upon that there are no additions to it. As for deletions, the known view of the Muslims is that it did not happen, and this is closest to the correct view of our school. Many narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah as well as the Shī'ah indicate that a number of verses were deleted or transferred from place to place. However these narrations are āḥād and thus they are not definite. It is more appropriate to turn away

from it (the narrations), and to abstain from being occupied with it, as it is possible to interpret it.

If they are authentic, they do not criticise that which is between the two covers, as the authenticity thereof is well-known. None of the Imāms objected to it or rejected it. Our narrations encourage recitation of it and holding on to that which is in it. We are also instructed to compare the narrations to it when they contradict in secondary issues and thereafter to practise upon that which conforms to it and discard that which does not conform to it.

A narration is reported from Nabī ﷺ, which no one rejects. He said, “I am leaving amongst you al-Thaqalayn; the Book of Allah, and my household. They will not separate until they meet me at the pond.” This establishes that it will be found in every era, as it is not possible that he commands his ummah to hold onto that which they cannot hold on to. The Ahl al-Bayt and those whose obedience is compulsory are likewise found in every era. Since the authenticity of that which is found amongst us is agreed upon by all, it is necessary for us to concern ourselves with its tafsīr, and explaining its meanings, leaving out all else.¹

This is the speech of their scholar al-Ṭūsī, who authored two of their seminal works in ḥadīth and two of their relied upon books on narrators. Did he say this out of Taqiyyah?

I say, among the signs of Taqiyyah is that there will be contradictions and differences. However, contradictions have become a norm in their narrations. In fact, it is even found in what they refer to as consensus. Thus, it is no surprise that the speech of their scholars have a fair share of it too. It has become exceptionally difficult to realise the actual stance of their school. Even their scholars are baffled, as they find no proof by which they can differentiate between that which was said out of Taqiyyah and that which was actually meant. Their only way out is to rely on a principle laid by an ultra-profane individual amongst them:

1 *Al-Tibyān* 1/3

If two contradictory ahādīth are presented to you, take that which opposes the people (Ahl al-Sunnah).¹

This principle leads them, in most cases, to leaving the dīn completely.² It is natural for any religion which is not from Allah to have many contradictions. “If it had been from [any] other than Allah, they would have found within it much contradiction.”³ Thus, if he is quoting narrations from their books, it is inevitable that there would be contradictions. Therefore, we cannot take him to task completely, since he rejected the view. Added to that, his view is judged by that which he said, not by that he narrated.

It has been noted that al-Ṭūsī, in his re-arrangement of *Rijāl al-Kashshī* quotes some narrations regarding this tale. Among them are:

لا تأخذن معالم دينك من غير شيعتنا، فإنك إن تعديتهم أخذت دينك عن الخائنين الذين خانوا الله ورسوله، وخانوا أماناتهم، إنهم اؤتمنوا على كتاب الله جل وعلا فحرّفوا وبدّلوه

Do not take the guidelines of your religion from anyone other than our sect. if you go beyond them, you will be taking your religion from traitors, who were treacherous toward Allah, His Rasūl and their trusts. They were trusted with the Book of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى but they changed it and altered it...⁴

He also reports some narrations regarding this tale, in his *Tafsīr al-Tibyān*, portraying them to be different qirā’āt.⁵ However, he believes that all of these

1 *Al-Biḥār* 2/233

2 A discussion will appear regarding this under the discussion of consensus, if Allah wills.

3 *Sūrah al-Nisā’*: 82

4 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 4

5 An example of this is his explanation of the verse:

Indeed, Allah chose Ādam and Nūḥ and the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of ‘Imrān over the worlds... (*Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān*: 33). *continued on page 395*

narrations are Āḥād, which cannot be relied upon, and they cannot cancel out all their narrations which instruct that the Qur’ān should be practised upon and referred to at the time of disputes, as stated by him whilst explaining his rejection of the view.

As for the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, his explanations of this rejection (which caused him pain, as it is against his view) have differed. At times, he says that this is only the view of al-Ṭūsī and a small group of Shī’ah. His exact words are:

إنه ليس فيه حكاية إجماع عليه، بل قوله: نصره المرتضى صريح في عدمه، بل في قلة الداهيين إليه

There is no claim of *ijmā’* regarding it. Instead, his statement, “al-Murtaḍā supported it,” explicitly defies it, or rather, highlights that only a few people held the view.¹

Later, he retracts saying that this was only said by him on account of Taqiyyah, as his rejection is recorded in *Tafsīr al-Tibyān*. He says:

continued from page 394

He says:

وفي قراءة أهل البيت: {وآل محمد على العالمين}

The *qirā’ah* of the Ahl al-Bayt is, “and the family of Muḥammad over the worlds.”

This is a very mild way of stating that Taḥrīf took place, or it is an attempt at changing their narrations which clearly state this is not one of the *qirā’āt*. These narrations claim that it was in fact changed by the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. The exact texts of these narrations will appear shortly when we scrutinise the stance of al-Ṭabarsī. The motive behind the attempt at changing these narrations was either to cover up the shame that this brings upon them, or to pull his people out from the gutters into which they fell on account of those tales. However, at times, the narrations of al-Ṭūsī are the original narrations and the additions which explicitly state Taḥrīf were added by the scholars of the Safavid dynasty. An objection could be raised that these narrations are also found in the books of his contemporaries or scholars who appeared before him such as *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, *al-’Ayyāshī* and *al-Furāt*. The answer to this is that the Shī’ah do not hesitate to change the books of their older scholars, as is established from the book *Kitāb Sulaym ibn Qays*.

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 38

لا يخفى على المتأمل في كتاب التبيان أن طريقته فيه على نهاية المداراة والمماشاتة مع المخالفين

It is quite clear to the one who ponders that the style of *al-Tibyān* was one of extreme compromise and adopting the views of the opposition.¹

He backs this argument by the fact that the author quoted many of the tafsīrs of the Ahl al-Sunnah.² However, he cannot say this with certainty. He says:

وهو - أي نقل الطوسي لأقوال أئمة السنة - بمكان من الغرابة لو لم يكن على وجه المماشاتة، فمن المحتمل أن يكون هذا القول - يعني إنكار التحريف - منه (من الطوسي) فيه (في تفسير البيان) على نحو ذلك (أي من المداراة والتقية)

It (al-Ṭūsī's quoting from the Ahl al-Sunnah) is quite strange, if it was not done with the intention of compromising. It is possible that this view (rejecting Taḥrīf) of his (al-Ṭūsī) in it (*Tafsīr al-Bayān*) was also due to this (i.e. Taqiyyah and compromise).

Thereafter, a third idea comes to his mind. He says that the speech of al-Ṭūsī contains such contradictions which indicate towards them being Taqiyyah. He says:

إن إخباره بأن ما دل على النقصان روايات كثيرة يناقض قوله: لكن طريقه الآحاد، إلا أن يحمل ما ذكرنا

His narrations which indicate that changes took place are many. They contradict his statement, "they are āḥād." Unless it is interpreted in the manner that we explained (i.e. Taqiyyah).³

Lastly, he forgets all of the above and chooses to excuse al-Ṭūsī. He says:

معدور (في إنكاره) لقلّة تتبعه من قلّة تلك الكتب عنده

He is excused in his rejection thereof, as he did not do sufficient research, due to him not possessing many of those books.⁴

1 Ibid pg. 38

2 The complete text regarding this was quoted previously.

3 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 38

4 Ibid pg. 351

This is one angle of the bafflement of al-Ṭabarsī regarding the matter of al-Ṭūsī and others who rejected this fabrication. If this is the condition of their scholars, that they cannot agree as to what is the stance of their Imāms and classical scholars on account of Taqiyyah, then we are more deserving of being excused for not being able to arrive at a definite conclusion regarding the stance of their scholars.

Al-Ṭūsī, as seen from his rejection, added vinegar to the honey, and he contradicted himself whilst stating the stance of his school, as is apparent.¹

Al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā and His Rejection Taḥrīf

He says:

إن العلم بصحة نقل القرآن كالعلم بالبلدان والحوادث الكبار والوقائع العظام والكتب المشهورة وأشعار العرب المسطورة، فإن العناية اشتدت والدواعي توفرت على نقله وحراسته، وبلغت إلى حد لم يبلغه فيما [لعلها] ”ما ذكرناه“. لأن القرآن معجزة النبوة، ومأخذ العلوم الشرعية، والأحكام الدينية، وعلماء

1 Amongst this is his claim that the Ahl al-Sunnah also reported this kufr. This is a blatant lie. Their scholar, al-Mufid testified that none besides the Shī'ah have narrated this calamity. Refer to *Awā'il al-Maqālāt* pg. 13. The Ahl al-Sunnah are unanimous, in fact, all Muslims are unanimous that the Book of Allah ﷻ remained protected from any changes, additions and deletions. Allah Himself protected it. Allah says:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ

Indeed, it is We who sent down the message [i.e., the Qur'ān], and indeed, We will be its guardian. (Sūrah al-Hijr: 9)

Have a look at what the scholars of tafsīr from the Ahl al-Sunnah had to say regarding this verse. Refer to al-Qurṭubī: *Jāmi' Ahkām al-Qur'ān* 10/65, al-Nasafī: *Madārik al-Ta'wīl* 2/179, *Tafsīr al-Khāzin* 4/47, *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 2/592, *Tafsīr al-Baghawī* 3/44, al-Bayḍāwī: *Anwār al-Tanzīl* 1/538, al-Ālūsī: *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī* 14/16, Ṣiddīq Khān: *Fath al-Bayān* 5/168, 169, al-Sanhqī: *Aḍwā' al-Bayān* 3/120, Sayyid Quṭb: *Fī Zilāl al-Qur'ān* 5/194 as well as others. Also refer to the quotations in the books of the Imāms of the Ahl al-Sunnah which state that there is unanimity that the Book of Allah was protected and safeguarded, and whoever opposes that is a kāfir. Refer to al-Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ: *al-Shifā* 2/304-305, Ibn Qudāmah: *Lum'at al-I'tiqād* pg. 20, al-Baghḍādī: *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg. 327, Ibn Ḥazm: *al-Fiṣal* 5/22.

المسلمين قد بلغوا في حفظه وحمايته الغاية حتى عرفوا كل شيء اختلف فيه من إعرابه وقراءته وحروفه وآياته، فكيف يجوز أن يكون مغيراً ومنقوصاً مع العناية الصادقة والضبط الشديد

Knowledge regarding the authenticity of the Qurʾān is like knowledge of the cities, major events, significant occurrences, the famous books and the recorded poems of the Arabs. Great effort was made and there was every reason for its protection and propagation. It reached a standard that none of the other things we had mentioned reached. This is because the Qurʾān was the miraculous challenge supporting nubuwwah, the source of Islamic knowledge and religious verdicts. The scholars of the Muslims reached the pinnacle in their efforts to protect and safeguard it, to the extent that they learnt every variation of it, whether it pertained to the diacritics, the recitals, letters or verses. How is it then possible that it could have been changed or shortened, when such a genuine effort was made and it was learnt this well?

Thereafter, he mentions that if anyone intended to add on or delete from the famous books such as the book of Sībwayh or al-Muzanī it would have been known and reported, as the people of the science are acquainted with the fine details just as they are acquainted with the major aspects. If anyone wished to add on a chapter of *naḥw* (grammar) to the book of Sībwayh or al-Muzanī, which was not part of the original book, it would have immediately been known that this is not part of the original book.

ومعلوم أن العناية بالقرآن وضبطه أصدق من العناية بنقل كتاب سيبويه ودواوين الشعراء..

وإن من خالف ذلك من الإمامية والحشوية لا يعتد بخلافهم، فإن الخلاف في ذلك مضاف إلى قوم من أصحاب الحديث نقلوا أخباراً ضعيفة ظنوا صحتها لا يرجع بمثلها عن المعلوم المقطوع على صحته

It is an undisputed fact that the effort behind the protection and learning of the Qurʾān was far greater than the effort made in preserving the book of Sībwayh and the poetry of the poets. Those who dispute this, from the Imāmiyyah and the Ḥashawiyyah, do not deserve any attention. There is some difference of opinion, which is attributed to the people of ḥadīth.

They narrate some unauthentic narrations, which they regard as authentic. The likes of those cannot be used to reject that, the authenticity of which is known without any doubt.¹

Perhaps his last sentence is a reference to the view of the Akhbārī Shī'ah, who accept this deviation.²

These are the words of their scholar, al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (who Ibn Ḥazm excluded from those who believe in the kufr regarding the subject, as explained). The author of *Majma' al-Bayān*, after quoting this stated:

إن المرتضى قد استوفى في الكلام في نصره هذا المذهب الحق في جواب المسائل الطرابلسيات

Al-Murtaḍā done justice in supporting this correct view in *Jawāb al-Masā'il al-Ṭarābulusiyyāt*.³

We could not find this book, and the latter day Shī'ah do not quote from it (al-Kāshānī in *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi*, al-Baḥrānī in *al-Burhān*, al-Majlisī in *Al-Biḥār*, etc.). I could not find anything from it (in all that I searched in) besides this text, which was transmitted by al-Ṭabarsī in *Majma' al-Bayān*. However, it has been said that this rejection was done out of Taqiyyah, this is because, as stated by the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*:

قد عدّ هو في الشافعي من مطاعن عثمان ومن عظيم ما أقدم عليه جمع الناس على قراءة زيد وإحراقه وإبطاله ما شك أنه من القرآن

He counted, in *al-Shāfi*, among the faults and serious crimes of 'Uthmān that he united the people upon the recitation of Zayd and he burnt and

1 Refer to *Majma' al-Bayān* 1/31

2 Al-Ālūsī was under the impression that he was referring to the Ahl al-Sunnah. Therefore, he commented saying, "it is either a lie or a terrible misunderstanding, as they are unanimous that no shortening took place in that which is reported to be Qur'ān, with tawātur, as is found between the two covers today," *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī*: 1/24-25

3 Refer to *Majma' al-Bayān* 1/31

destroyed that regarding which he had doubts as to whether it is part of the Qur'ān.¹

This undoubtedly negates his rejection of Taḥrīf as well as the historic and intellectual proofs that he presented to disprove it. Either this text was added to his book, like in the other cases. This possibility is strengthened by the fact that if this was his belief, he would have spoken about it on many occasions, but the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* could only reproduce one statement.

The other possibility is that his rejection was on account of Taqiyyah. This possibility is much weaker than the previous one, based on what we have just mentioned. This text, added to the fact that it is an insult directed against the Book of Allah, it also suggests that the entire ummah, including 'Alī رضي الله عنه, were all upon deviation. This is from a people who claimed to support and love him!

How can a Muslim imagine that this took place in that unique Qur'ānīc generation, who spent everything and migrated, leaving behind their wives and children; to spread Islam. They left their hometowns purely for the sake of Allah. For whose benefit, and in whose cause would they then sacrifice all of their great sacrifices, struggles and privileges of being the leaders in dīn? Why would they sell their dīn and *dunyā* (worldly life), and co-operate with one who wished to distort their dīn and their book? Indeed, this is a great accusation! Rather, this act of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه was among his greatest achievements, and it took place with the consensus of the ummah, as stated by Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī رضي الله عنه:

لا تقولوا في عثمان إلا خيراً فوالله ما فعل في المصاحف إلا عن ملاء منها

You should only praise 'Uthmān, for by the oath of Allah, he only acted regarding the copies in conjunction with a group from us.²

May Allah reward him greatly on behalf of the ummah.

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 33

2 Reported by Ibn Abī Dāwūd with an authentic chain, as stated by Ibn Ḥajar in *Fath al-Bārī* 13/18.

Al-Ṭabarsī and his Rejection of Taḥrīf

He says:

ومن ذلك الكلام في زيادة القرآن ونقصانه، فإنه لا يليق بالتفسير، فأما الزيادة فيه فمجمع على بطلانها، وأما النقصان منه فقد روى جماعة من أصحابنا وقوم من حشوية العامة أن في القرآن تغييراً ونقصاناً، والصحيح من مذهب أصحابنا خلافه، وهو الذي نصره المرتضى قدس الله وروحه، واستوفى الكلام فيه غاية الاستيفاء في جواب المسائل الطرابلسيات “ثم ساق بعض كلامه في ذلك

From that is the speech regarding additions and deletions in the Qur’ān. They do not deserve any explanation. As for additions, it is agreed upon that they do not exist. Regarding deletions, a group of our scholars, as well as the Ḥashawīyyah from the majority have reported that changes and shortening took place in the Qur’ān. The correct view of our school is the opposite of that. This is what was supported by al-Murtaḍā (may Allah sanctify his soul). He explained this matter fully in *Jawāb al-Masā’il al-Ṭarābulusiyyāt*. (Thereafter, he quotes a portion of his discussion, which had been quoted above).

Here, he indicates that a group from his scholars reported narrations regarding changes and shortening which took place in the Qur’ān, and that the view of the research scholars is contrary to this. He tries, as usual, to include the Ahl al-Sunnah among the supporters of this kufr by saying, “the Ḥashawīyyah from the majority”. This is done in an attempt to defend his sect, save their face and carry out a subtle attack upon the Ahl al-Sunnah. The reply is as stated by al-Ālūsī, “it is either a lie or a terrible misunderstanding, as they are unanimous that no shortening took place in that which is reported to be Qur’ān, with tawātur, as is found between the two covers today.”

Yes, in the era of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, that which was not mutawātir, that which was abrogated as far as the recital was concerned (but it was still recited by those who were unaware of its abrogation), and that which was not part of al-‘Urḍat al-Akhīrah (the final recital of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام) was excluded. He left no stone unturned in ascertaining the veracity of all that was

compiled. However the light of this only spread to the horizons during the era of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.¹

Al-Ālusī scrutinised the statement of al-Ṭabarsī and explained his mistakes. Al-Ālusī goes on to say that his explanation as to why he regards this fabrication as false is such that it exposes the lack of substance of the view of the opposition, even to children. All praise is due to Allah. The truth was revealed without the Muslims even having to make any effort.² I realised, whilst studying *Majma‘ al-Bayān*, that al-Ṭabarsī tried very hard to cover up this mess of theirs.

Regarding some of the narrations of his companions which are related to this tale — which state that the original verse was such and it was then changed to something else — he tries to change the purport of the narration to fool the Ahl al-Sunnah, or he tries to change it so that this shameful act of theirs becomes ambiguous. He claims that some of these ‘verses’ were actually different qirā’āt.

We will present a few examples of their tales regarding Taḥrīf, followed by the changes thereof by al-Ṭabarsī. *Tafsīr al-Qummī* states regarding the verse:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ اصْطَفَىٰ آدَمَ وَنُوحًا وَآلَ إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَآلَ عِمْرَانَ عَلَى الْعَالَمِينَ

Indeed, Allah chose Ādam and Nūḥ and the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of ‘Imrān over the worlds...³

قال العالم رضي الله عنه - نزل: "وآل عمران وآل محمد على العالمين" فأسقطوا آل محمد من الكتاب

The scholar (Imām) said, “It was revealed, ‘and the family of ‘Imrān and the family of Muḥammad upon the worlds.’. They deleted, “the family of Muḥammad,” from the Book.”⁴

1 *Rūḥ al-Ma‘ānī* 1/25

2 *Ibid al-Ma‘ānī* 1/24

3 *Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān*: 33

4 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/100

Tafsīr al-Furāt reports from Ḥumrān, who said that he heard Abū Ja‘far (al-Bāqir) رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ reciting:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ اصْطَفَىٰ آدَمَ وَنُوحًا وَآلَ إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَآلَ مُحَمَّدٍ عَلَى الْعَالَمِينَ: قلت: ليس يقرأ هكذا، قال أدخل حرف مكان حرف

Indeed, Allah chose Ādam and Nūḥ and the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of Muḥammad over the worlds.

I said, “This is not how it is recited.” He replied, “one letter (word) was replaced with another.”¹

Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī reports from Hishām ibn Sālim:

سألت أبا عبد الله عن قوله تعالى: {إِنَّ اللَّهَ اصْطَفَىٰ آدَمَ وَنُوحًا وَآلَ إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَآلَ عِمْرَانَ عَلَى الْعَالَمِينَ} قال: “هو آل إبراهيم وآل محمد على العالمين فوضوا اسماً مكان اسم

I asked Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) regarding the verse of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, “indeed, Allah chose Ādam and Nūḥ and the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of ‘Imrān over the worlds.” He replied, “it was, ‘the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of Muḥammad over the worlds,’ but they replaced one name with another.”²

The purpose behind this fabrication was to establish their belief regarding twelve Imāms from the Book of Allah. However, they did not realise that the connotations of the expression “family of Muḥammad” are quite general. On the contrary, the twelve Imāms according to them are ‘Alī, his two sons and some of the progeny of only one son رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. The rest of them, as will appear, have been reviled and declared kāfir. Thus, the objective behind their lies and interpretations have not been attained.

1 *Tafsīr Furāt* pg. 18, *Bihār al-Anwār* 92/56

2 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 1/168, *al-Burhān* 1/278, *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 244

These fabrications, which contain accusations against the Book of Allah and the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ (including the Ahl al-Bayt) — which are oft quoted in their tafsīrs — are re-interpreted by the author of *Majma' al-Bayān* in these words:

وفي قراءة أهل البيت: وآل محمد على العالمين

According to the qirā'ah of the Ahl al-Bayt (it is), “and the family of Muḥammad over the worlds.”¹

Similarly, he re-interpreted many of their lies as qirā'āt.² On some occasions, he creates the impression that those fabrications were explanations of the meanings of verses. Their fabrication says concerning the verse of Allah ﷻ:

1 *Majma' al-Bayān* 2/62

2 Another example is the verse of Allah:

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ جَاهِدِ الْكُفَّارَ وَالْمُنَافِقِينَ وَاغْلُظْ عَلَيْهِمْ

O Prophet, fight against the disbelievers and the hypocrites and be harsh upon them. (Sūrah al-Towbah: 73)

Tafsīr al-Qummī says, “the actual revelation was, ‘fight against the disbelievers using the hypocrites,’ as Nabī ﷺ did not fight the hypocrites using a sword.” *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/301. This is a fabrication that was concocted to support the view of the Rāfiḍah, who accuse the Ṣaḥābah of hypocrisy. He claims that Allah instructed Nabī ﷺ to rely upon the hypocrites in his jihād. He portrayed Jihād as an act that is shouldered by the hypocrites. Thus, it is ignorance that brings to shame Islam, the history of the Muslims as well as the commentary of the Qur’ān. It is outright profanity. Yet we see al-Ṭabarsī expressing this lie in the words, “a narration of the qirā'ah of the Ahl al-Bayt is, ‘fight against the kuffār using the hypocrites.’”. He tried to explain his interpretation saying, “he would only be polite towards the hypocrites because they would not openly display kufr. The fact that Allah knew of their kufr did not make it permissible to kill them, as they outwardly displayed imān.” (*Majma' al-Bayān* 3/100) This explanation is inconsistent with the meaning of the verse. Allah commanded His Nabī to fight against the kuffār and the hypocrites, so how was it possible that he was polite towards the hypocrites in the sense that he relied upon them to fight the kuffār? Furthermore, Jihād in Islam was never shouldered by the hypocrites. Allah says:

لَوْ خَرَجُوا فِيكُمْ مَا زَادُوكُمْ إِلَّا خَبَالًا

Had they gone forth with you, they would not have increased you except in confusion. (Sūrah al-Towbah: 47) *continued on page 405*

ذَلِكَ بِأَنَّهُمْ كَرِهُوا مَا أُنْزِلَ اللَّهُ فَاحْبَطَ أَعْمَالَهُمْ

That is because they disliked what Allah revealed, so He rendered worthless their deeds.¹

عن أبي جعفر نزل جبرائيل على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله بهذه الآية هكذا: "ذلك بأنهم كرهوا ما أنزل الله (في علي) فأحبط أعمالهم"

Abū Ja'far (al-Bāqir) says that Jibrīl revealed this verse upon Rasūlullāh ﷺ in this manner, "that is because they disliked what Allah revealed regarding 'Alī, so He rendered worthless their deeds."

Pay attention to their addition, "regarding 'Alī".² You will see that this changes, in the works of al-Ṭabarsī to an explanation of the verse. He says:

كرهوا ما أنزل الله في حق علي رضي الله عنه

They disliked that which Allah revealed regarding the rights of 'Alī ﷺ.³

This is only some of that which appears in *Majma' al-Bayān*, which was authored on account of the objectives like that of al-Tibyān of al-Ṭūsī. The leading scholar

continued from page 404

The pious predecessors have explained the meaning of this verse; fight against the kuffār using the sword and kill them. Similarly, fight against the hypocrites using your tongue and abandon all diplomacy. This was stated by Ibn 'Abbās رضي الله عنه. Ibn Mas'ūd رضي الله عنه explained, "(fight them by) hand, tongue or the heart, according to your capability. Do not meet them except with a frown." Ḥasan and Qatādah said, "carry out the punishment upon them." All of these explanations have one thing in common; they carry the meaning of the verse — fighting the hypocrites. This is why 'Aṭā said, "this verse abrogated all types of forgiveness and overlooking." Refer to *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 12/174-183, and *Tafsīr al-Baghawī* 2/311. The great difference between the wording of the verse, which commands that the hypocrites should be fought, and the fabricated qirā'ah, which suggests that they should be relied upon, has become quite clear.

1 Sūrah Muḥammad: 9

2 Refer to *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 330

3 *Majma' al-Bayān* 6/32

of the Shī'ah of the latter days, al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, declared that *al-Tibyān* was written on the basis of Taqiyyah and compromising to please the opposition. If this is true, it applies to both books, as the methodology of the two are identical.

Some, who are affiliated with the Ahl al-Sunnah, have been duped by this methodology. Thus, they aligned themselves with *Dār al-Taqrīb* (which was operational until recently, when its true agenda became apparent) in Cairo. Hence, under the pretext of bridging the gap (between the Muslims and the contemporary mainstream Shī'ah), they published this book. It was researched and authenticated by six scholars who were affiliated with the Ahl al-Sunnah.¹ This happens when a person is unaware of their statements. He will not be able to realise their trickery and deception. It seems as if this very Tafsīr was the reason why some of the Shī'ah considered al-Ṭabarsī's rejection of the belief in Taḥrīf to be Taqiyyah.

These are the four scholars whose views have been reported. Perhaps there were others who held the same view but their statements did not reach us. This possibility is strengthened by the fact that al-Mufīd, in *Awā'il al-Maqālāt*, stated that an entire group from the Imāmiyyah rejected Taḥrīf. We will not assume, as was assumed by the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* (who tried his best to silence the voice of the opposition, and claim that most of the Shī'ah held his view), that a fifth individual could not be found in the early days who held the same view as these four.

Lastly, it is my view that the rejection of these senior Shī'ī figures of the fabrication regarding the Book of Allah should not be brushed off as Taqiyyah (as stated by some of the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shī'ah), as we have no definite way to prove that. You have read the arguments presented by both parties, which was quoted from *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*. Added to that, it became clear that the Shī'ah are incessant liars, who do not hesitate to add on to the books of their scholars. Thus, the one who distances himself from this kufr, after believing in Allah and His Rasūl ﷺ,

1 Refer to *Majma' al-Bayān* 10/575, printed by Dār al-Taqrīb

we will accept this from him and hand his matter over to Allah, who is aware of the reality.

However, the matter does not end there. Rejection of this view demands that a few more steps should be taken. To start off with, they should take a second look into all those matters in which they have differed with the Muslims. Their scholar, al-Majlisī (in rebuttal of those who reject Taḥrīf) admitted that they will have to tread this path, as rejection of the narrations regarding Taḥrīf — which, by virtue to their forged and fabricated narrations, have reached the level of tawātur — would necessitate rejection of all their narrations. This is the reality! The fact that their books are replete with these narrations (to the extent that they can say that it is mutawātir), is the greatest proof that their books are compilations and collections of lies and fabrications.

The Crux of the Discussion

Firstly, it is possible that this fabrication found its way into Shī'ism in the second century, courtesy of some extremists. Some of their names have already been mentioned. They were prompted by the fact that the Book of Allah was completely pure of their innovations regarding Imāmah, the Ṣaḥābah as well as other matters.

Secondly, most of the books which they consider reliable have this fabrication recorded in them. Most of these narrations are explicit, thus they cannot be re-interpreted to be explanations of the verses or different qirā'āt. They clearly state that a certain verse was originally such and such, but the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ changed it. The following are examples of the explicit words used:

هذه الآية مما غيروا وحرفوا

This verse is among that which they (the Ṣaḥābah رضى الله عنهم) changed and altered.¹

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 92/55

أنزل الله سبعة بأسمائهم فمحت قريش ستة وتركوا أبا لهب

Allah revealed seven, taking their names, but the Quraysh deleted six and left the name of Abū Lahab.¹

كانت فيه أسماء رجال فألقيت

The names of men were in it, but they were thrown out.²

هكذا والله نزل به جبرائيل على محمد ولكنه فيما حرف من كتاب الله

By the oath of Allah, this is how Jibrīl revealed it upon Muḥammad, but it is among that which was changed from the Book of Allah.³

بلى والله إنه لمثبت فيها وإن أول من غير ذلك لابن أروى

Nay, by the oath of Allah, it was part of it. The first person who changed that was Ibn Arwā.⁴

There are many other examples like these. Thus, if any Shīʿī claims that the narrations in their books are narrations pertaining to qirāʾāt or they are among those verses, the recitation of which has been abrogated, then he is attempting to hide this kufr, and he wishes to equate the truth with falsehood.

Thirdly, many of their scholars have stated that these narrations are found in abundance in their reliable books. This, undoubtedly, is a shame upon their books, and not the Book of Allah. In an attempt to rid themselves of this shame, and emerge from this abyss, some of the intelligent ones among them tried to hide or do away with this view. However, these narrations increased with the passing of

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 290, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/54

2 *Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī* 1/12, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/55

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/56

4 *Tafsīr Furāt* 177, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 91/56

each era, despite the rejection of those who rejected it. Some heretics, who joined the ranks of the Shī'ah made it their responsibility to spread this rubbish. There is no doubt that the one who subscribes to this kufr has nothing to do with Islam. He has no link with the Book of Allah, the religion that Allah revealed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ or the Ahl al-Bayt. His religion is something other than Islam.

However, despite this, we see that those who narrate the tales which claim that the Qur'ān was changed (such as al-Majlisī in *Biḥār al-Anwār*, al-Ṭabarsī in *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*) do not hesitate to use the Book of Allah as proof. They even begin each chapter of their books with a verse from the Book of Allah. Al-Majlisī does this in his *Biḥār*, al-Ṭabarsī does it in *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* and other authors also do the same. In fact, al-Ṭabarsī, who wrote that which he wrote in *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, has a chapter in his book *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* named, "Chapter: It is commendable to perform wuḍū before touching the writing of the Qur'ān, and it is impermissible for a person who does not have wuḍū or is impure to write the Qur'ān."¹

Al-Majlisī, the scholar of the Shī'ah, who claimed that there are many narrations regarding the fabrication and they are no less in number than the narrations regarding Imāmāh says:

أَنَّ الَّذِي بَيْنَ الدَّفَتَيْنِ كَلَامُ اللَّهِ تَعَالَى عَلَى الْحَقِيقَةِ مِنْ غَيْرِ زِيَادَةٍ وَلَا نَقْصَانٍ

Whatever is between the two covers is the actual speech of Allah ﷻ, without any addition or deletion.²

Thereafter, he realised that this contradicts their narrations regarding Taḥrīf. Thus he said:

فَإِنْ قَالَ قَائِلٌ: كَيْفَ يَصَحُّ الْقَوْلُ بِأَنَّ الَّذِي بَيْنَ الدَّفَتَيْنِ هُوَ كَلَامُ اللَّهِ تَعَالَى عَلَى الْحَقِيقَةِ مِنْ غَيْرِ زِيَادَةٍ وَلَا نَقْصَانٍ، وَأَنْتُمْ تَرَوْنَ عَنِ الْأَئِمَّةِ عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ أَنَّهُمْ قَرَأُوا: "كُنْتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ" أَوْ "كَذَلِكَ

1 *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* 1/43

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/75

جعلناكم أئمة وسطاً“ وقرؤوا: “يسألونك الأنفال” وهذا بخلاف ما في المصحف الذي في أيدي الناس؟ قيل له... إن الأخبار التي جاءت بذلك أخبار آحاد لا يقطع على الله بصحتها، فلذلك وقفنا فيها، ولم نعدل عما في المصحف الظاهر على ما أمرنا به.. مع أنه لا ننكر أن تأتي القراءة على وجهين منزلتين أحدهما ما تضمنه المصحف، والثاني ما جاء به الخبر، كما يعترف مخالفونا به من نزول القرآن على وجوه شتى

If anyone objects saying, “how is it possible to say that whatever is between the two covers is the actual speech of Allah, without any addition or deletion, when you narrate that the Imāms recited, ‘you are the best of Imāms, who have been selected for humanity’, ‘we made you moderate A’immah,’ and ‘They ask you for the spoils’? These are all against the copy that the people have.” It will be said to him, “the narrations which have been reported regarding that are all āhād. It cannot be said with certainty that they are from Allah. Thus, we have hesitated regarding them, and we have not turned away from that which is in the available copies, in compliance to that which we have been instructed to do... We do not negate that a verse could have two revealed qirā’āt, one which is in conformity to that which appears in the (peoples) copy and one which is like that which appears in the narrations. Our opposition also admit that the Qur’ān was revealed with many different variations.”¹ (Thereafter, he points out a few of those variations)

If this was the real stance of those who spread those beliefs of kufr, then why did they spread and quote those fabrications? The answer is quite clear from all of that which has already passed, i.e. they wished to pacify their people and supporters that their beliefs are correct, and that the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم removed the verses which testify to the truth of their cult. This is also why we see them claiming that other books, besides the Qur’ān, were revealed. Then they resorted to an ‘inner’ interpretation. These were all different schemes which they used to establish their corrupt beliefs.

Even though these efforts were primarily to get themselves out of the trouble that they were in, the consequences and effects thereof, upon some sects of the Shī’ah

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/75

were exceptionally destructive.¹ In fact, the effects upon the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah themselves were no less. The Akhbārīs amongst them grant precedence to their narrations over the Book of Allah, as explained. Another serious consequence that came about was that they were believed to have their own version of the Qur’ān.

Fourthly, just as they have narrations in which it is claimed that Taḥrīf took place, they also have narrations which reject this great lie, such as the statement of their Imām:

واجتمعت الأمة قاطبة لا اختلاف بينهم في ذلك أن القرآن حق لا ريب فيه عند جميع فرقها، فهم في حالة الاحتجاج عليه مصيبون، وعلى تصديق ما أنزل الله مهتدون، لقول النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم: ”لا تجتمع أمتي على ضلالة“

The entire ummah are unanimous, with no difference of opinion between them, that the Qur’ān is the truth and there is no doubt regarding it. This is accepted by all of its sects. Thus, when they use it as proof, they are correct and when they believe in that which Allah revealed, they are rightly guided, as Nabī ﷺ said, “my ummah will never be unanimous upon misguidance.”²

Similarly the narrations regarding the virtues of reciting Qur’ān,³ the merits of the one who carries the Qur’ān in his bosom,⁴ the necessity of comparing their narrations to the Qur’ān,⁵ holding onto it until Qiyāmah, etc., all negate their claim that the Qur’ān had been changed or that the true copy is in the possession of their awaited saviour.

1 Like the Drüz, who made up their own copy named, *Muṣḥaf al-Munfarid Bithātih*. Refer to Muṣṭafā al-Shak’ah: *Islām bi lā Madh-hab* (introduction to the fifth print), al-Khaṭīb: ‘*Aqīdat al-Drüz* pg. 138-184

2 Refer to al-Sha’rānī: *Ta’ālīq ‘Ilmiyyah* (‘*alā Sharḥ al-Kāfi li al-Māzindarānī*) 2/414. Refer to the exact text under the discussion, “their beliefs regarding ijmā’”.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*, Kitāb Faḥl al-Qur’ān 2/611

4 Ibid 3/603

5 Ibid 1/59

Fifthly, it became clear to us that this fabrication refutes itself, and that among its components was that which destroys it. It merely has to be presented for the falsity of it to be seen. It also serves as evidence against the Rawāfiḍ, proving them to be great liars. ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام, who is a deity according to most of them, a Nabī according to some of them and an infallible Imām according to all of them, who was eventually made the khalīfah and was granted rule, due to which he had all authority for the period of five years and nine months could not do anything about the ‘false’ Qur’ān. It was being recited in the Masjids in every place, he himself would recite it whilst leading the ṣalāh and there were copies everywhere. If he felt that there was any change to it, as claimed by the Rāfiḍah, then why did he sanction all of this? His son, Ḥasan succeeded him, but simply followed in the footsteps of his father and allowed everything to continue.

So where did these liars appear from, and how could they even claim that a single alphabet was changed, added or deleted? He (Amīr al-Mu’minīn) would have fought a much more fierce battle against those who changed the Qur’ān, as compared to the battle against the people of Shām, who opposed him in a matter which was extremely trivial compared to the Qur’ān. Thus, the lies of the Rāfiḍah have been exposed in a way that can never be denied. All praise belongs to Allah.¹

1 Ibn Ḥazm: *al-Fiṣal* 2/216-217

Chapter Two

Their Beliefs Regarding the Sunnah (Aḥādīth)

Imām ‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī considered the Shī‘ah to be among those who reject aḥādīth, based on the fact that they refuse to accept that which is narrated by the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.¹ We also find Imām al-Suyūṭī stating in his book *al-Iḥtijāj bi al-Sunnah* (using aḥādīth as proof) that in his era, a strange call was being made. It was a call towards abandoning the Sunnah, and sufficing upon the Qur’ān. He states that the originator of this call was a man from the Rāfiḍah, and this book was written by him to refute this view. Thus, the Shī‘ah are the enemies of the Sunnah. The Ahl al-Sunnah on the other hand follow the Sunnah of Muḥammad ﷺ, hence the name Ahl al-Sunnah.²

This is what some of the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah have to say. However, the Shī‘ah report from their Imāms:

أن كل شيء مردود إلى الكتاب والسنة وكل حديث لا يوافق كتاب الله فهو زخرف

Every matter should be referred to the Qur’ān and Sunnah, and every ḥadīth that does not conform to the Book of Allah is deception.³

There are other narrations of theirs which carry the same message.⁴ This implies that the Shī‘ah do not reject the Sunnah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. In fact they accept it and place it alongside the Book of Allah as a scale (to weigh matters and decide whether they are correct or incorrect) and an arbitrator. However, the one who studies the texts of the Shī‘ah and their narrations, will arrive at the conclusion

1 Refer to *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* pg. 322, 327, 346

2 *Al-Muntaqā* pg. 189, *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/175

3 *Al-Bahbūdī: Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfi* 1/11

4 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* (with its commentary, *Bāb al-Akhdh bi al-Sunnah wa Shawāhid al-Kitāb* 2/417), *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfi* 1/11

that the Shī'ah outwardly accept the Sunnah, but reject it secretly, as most of their views and narrations promote that which contradicts the Sunnah, as known to the Muslims, whether it be in the understanding, application, isnāds, texts, etc. This will be understood from the forthcoming discussion.

The Speech of the Imām is Like the Speech of Allah and His Rasūl

According to them, the Sunnah is:

كل ما يصدر عن المعصوم من قولٍ أو فعلٍ أو تقريرٍ

All that is done by *al-Ma'sūm* (infallible one), i.e. his actions, statements, and that which he approves of.¹

Whoever does not know the nature of their madh-hab, will not understand the degree to which they have opposed the Sunnah by means of this statement. This is because *al-Ma'sūm* is in fact Rasūlullāh ﷺ. However, the Shī'ah have granted this quality to many others, besides Rasūlullāh ﷺ. They regard the speech of these individuals to be of the same level as the speech of Allah and His Rasūl. These individuals are the Twelve Imāms. According to them, there is no difference between these twelve persons and the one who does not speak from [his own] inclination, his speech is not but a revelation revealed (i.e. Rasūlullāh ﷺ).

ليسوا من قبيل الرواة عن النبي والمحدثين عنه، ليكون قولهم حجة من جهة أنهم ثقات في الرواية؛ بل لأنهم هم المنصوبون من الله تعالى على لسان النبي لتبليغ الأحكام الواقعية، فلا يحكمون إلا عن الأحكام الواقعية عند الله تعالى كما هي

They are not narrators who report and transmit from Rasūlullāh ﷺ, due to which their statements would be proofs from the angle that they are reliable narrators from him. Rather, it is (their statements are proof) because they are appointed by Allah سبحانه وتعالى, through the medium of

1 Muḥammad Taqī al-Ḥakīm: *al-Uṣūl al-Āmmah li al-Fiqh al-Muqārīn* pg. 122

the speech of his Nabī, to convey the laws of realities. They do not pass judgements except from the laws of reality, as they are by Allah.¹

There is no difference between the speech of these twelve individuals which was uttered by them during their childhood and the speech that was uttered by them after reaching the age of maturity, according to the Shī'ah. This is because they believe that they would not err, neither intentionally or on account of human nature. Thus, one of their contemporary scholars says:

إن الاعتقاد بعصمة الأئمة جعل الأحاديث التي تصدر عنهم صحيحة دون أن يشترطوا إيصال سندها إلى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم كما هو الحال عند أهل السنة

The belief that the Imāms are infallible demands that the aḥādīth from them are authentic, without the requisite that its isnād should reach Rasūlullāh ﷺ, as is the condition of the Ahl al-Sunnah.²

This is due to their belief that Imāmah is a continuation of Nubuwwah³ according to them, and the Imāms are like Rusul. Ibn Bābāwayh says:

قولهم قول الله وأمرهم أمر الله وطاعتهم طاعة الله ومعصيتهم معصية الله وإنهم لم ينطقوا إلا عن الله تعالى وعن وحيه

Their speech is the speech of Allah, their commands are the commands of Allah, and their disobedience is the disobedience of Allah. They did not speak except on behalf of Allah and from His revelation.⁴

Al-Kāfi has an alleged narration from Abū 'Abd Allāh (which, in the Shī'ī madh-hab, is a definite proof):

1 Al-Muẓaffar: *Uṣūl al-Fiqh al-Muqārin* 3/51, al-Sālūs: *Athar al-Imāmah* pg. 274

2 'Abd Allah Fayyāḍ: *Tārīkh al-Imāmiyyah* pg. 140

3 Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar: *'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah* 166

4 Ibn Bābāwayh: *Al-I'tiqādāt* pg. 106

حديثي حديث أبي، وحديث أبي حديث جدي، وحديث جدي حديث الحسين، وحديث الحسين حديث الحسن، وحديث الحسن حديث أمير المؤمنين، وحديث أمير المؤمنين حديث رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، وحديث رسول الله قول الله عز وجل

My narrations are the narrations of my father, the narrations of my father are the narrations of my grandfather, my grandfather's narrations are the narrations of Ḥusayn, the narrations of Ḥusayn are the narrations of Amīr al-Mu'minīn, the narrations of Amīr al-Mu'minīn are the narrations of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the narrations of Rasūlullāh ﷺ are the statements of Allah ﷻ.¹

The commentator of *al-Kāfī* mentions that this statement means:

أن حديث كل واحد من الأئمة الظاهرين قول الله عز وجل، ولا اختلاف في أقوالهم كما لا اختلاف في قوله تعالى

The narrations of each one of the apparent Imāms are the speech of Allah ﷻ, and there is no incoherence in their speech, just as there is no incoherence in the speech of Allah ﷻ.²

He takes it a step further:

يجوز من سمع حديثاً عن أبي عبد الله - رضي الله عنه - أن يرويه عن أبيه أو عن أحد من أجداده، بل يجوز أن يقول: قال الله تعالى

It is permissible for the one who hears a narration from Abū 'Abd Allāh ﷺ to narrate it from his father or any of his fore-fathers. In fact, it is permissible for him to say, "Allah ﷻ said."³

This is clear permission to attribute the speech of mortals to Allah ﷻ. Thereafter, he mentions that some of their narrations state the permissibility of

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/53, *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 18/58

2 *Al-Māzindaranī: Sharḥ al-Jāmi'* 2/272

3 *Al-Māzindaranī: Sharḥ al-Jāmi'* 2/272

this, and even state that it is better to do so.¹ *Al-Kāfī* also has a narration from Abū Baṣīr who asked Abū ‘Abd Allāh:

الحديث أسمعته منك أرويه عن أبيك أو أسمعته عن أبيك أرويه عنك؟ قال: سواء، إلا أنك ترويه عن أبي
أحب إليّ. وقال أبو عبد الله - رضي الله عنه - لجميل: ما سمعت مني فاروه عن أبي

If I hear a narration from you, can I narrate it from your father and vice-versa? He replied, “(It is) the same, except that I prefer that you narrate it from my father.” Abū ‘Abd Allāh said to Jamīl, “Narrate whatever you hear from me, from my father.”²

These narrations clearly allow open lies and forgeries, as it gives them the license to narrate (for example) from Amīr al-Mu’minīn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that which he did not say. Rather it was (allegedly) said by one of his grandsons who was not known to be a man of knowledge. It is even permissible, according to these narrations, to attribute to ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that which they claim are the statements of their awaited Mahdī. It is recommended (as established from the last narration) to attribute their statements to the person furthest up in the chain. The author of *al-Kāfī* understood from this that it is best to attribute everything to Allah. This, undoubtedly, is the height of boldness against Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.

Thus, the Sunnah—according to them—is not just the Sunnah of Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, but the Sunnah of all the Imāms as well. The statements of these Imāms hold the same weight as the speech of Allah and His Rasūl صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Hence, they admit that this was added on to the pure Sunnah by the Shī‘ah. They say:

والحق الشيعة الإمامية كل ما يصدر عن أئمتهم الاثني عشر من قول أو فعل أو تقرير بالسنة الشريفة

The Shī‘ah Imāmiyyah have added all that was done by the Twelve Imāms, i.e. their actions, statements and that which they approved of to the noble Sunnah.³

1 Al-Māzindaranī: *Sharḥ al-jāmi‘* 2/272

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* (with *Sharḥ al-jāmi‘*) 2/259

3 Muḥammad Taqī al-Ḥakīm: *Sunnat Ahl al-Bayt* pg. 9

These statements are made by them on the basis of two dangerous elementary principles of theirs. These were indicated to by one of their contemporary scholars, who stated that the speech of the Imām, according to them, holds the same position as the speech of Nabī ﷺ, in the sense that it serves as proof, compliance to it is compulsory, and they do not pass judgements except in real matters as they are by Allah. This, he explains, is acquired by them in two different ways:

من طريق الإلهام كالنبي من طريق الوحي، أو من طريق التلقي عن المعصوم قبله كما قال مولانا أمير المؤمنين - عليه السلام -: "علمني رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ألف باب من العلم يفتح لي من كل باب ألف باب"

(Either) through inspiration (just as the Nabī would receive it through revelation) or from the previous infallible, as said by our master, Amīr al-Mu'minīn عليه السلام, "Rasūlullāh ﷺ taught me one thousand chapters, and each chapter opens up a thousand chapters to me."

Thus, the knowledge of the Imāms is of two types: new knowledge, which is granted to them through inspiration and other forms, and knowledge which is kept as a trust by them, which they inherited from Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Both of these are considered to be the Sunnah. We will now explain these two dangerous principles of the Shī'ah:

The First Principle; The Knowledge of the Imāms is Attained Through Inspiration and Revelation

The knowledge of the Imāms, according to them, is attained through inspiration. The reality of this is as stated by the author of *al-Kāfi* in his narrations from the Imāms:

النكت في القلوب وفي لفظ آخر له: فقذف في القلوب

1 Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar: *Uṣūl al-Fiqh* 3/51

Dots on the heart.¹ Or, according to another description of his, “It is placed in the heart.”

He unambiguously states that this is divine inspiration. He says:

وأما النكت في القلوب فالهام

As for the dots in the heart, they are divine inspiration.²

In other words, knowledge is placed in the heart of the Imām due to which he is inspired with the correct view, and it is impossible for him to err as he is infallible. This inspiration is not the only source of their knowledge, as this contemporary Shīʿī, whose words we have quoted, tried to explain. The author of *al-Kāfī* clearly stated that there are other avenues through which they acquire knowledge. He mentions some narrations wherein it is stated that among the sources of knowledge of the Imāms is ‘an impression in the ear’ from an angel. He explains:

وأما النكت في القلوب فالهام، وأما النقر في الأسماع فأمر الملك

As for the dots in the heart, they are inspiration, but the impressions in the ear are the commands of the angel.³

Al-Māzindarānī says:

إذن هناك وسيلة أخرى غير الإلهام، وهو نقر في الأسماع بتحديث الملك

Thus, there is another method, besides inspiration. It is the impression in the ears, spoken by the angel.⁴

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/264

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/264

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/264

4 Al-Māzindarānī: *Sharḥ al-jāmiʿ* 3/29

The Imām hears a voice, but he does not see the angel, as explained in four narrations of *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*, under the chapter, “The difference between a Rasūl, a Nabī and an inspired one”. All of these narrations state:

الإمام هو الذي يسمع الكلام ولا يرى الشخص

The Imām is the one who hears the speech, but does not see the individual.¹

The author of *Al-Biḥār* narrates fifteen narrations, all of which echo this meaning, under the chapter, “They are inspired and made to understand”.² A question arises: How does he know that it is the speech of the angel, if he does not see him? Their Imām says:

إنه يعطى السكينة والوقار حتى يعلم أنه كلام الملك

It gives tranquillity and composure, through which it is identified to be the speech of the angel.³

However, after a few chapters, the author of *al-Kāfī* belies that which he established, by quoting four narrations which affirm that the Imām does in fact see the angel. These narrations appear under the chapter, “The angels enter the houses of the Imāms عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام, walk on their carpets, and give them reports.”⁴ These four narrations are then increased by the author of *Biḥār al-Anwār* to sixteen. Under a chapter named, “The angels come to them, walk on their carpets, and they see the angels”, he quotes these narrations, which emphasise, in clearer words that the Imāms see the angels.⁵

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/176-177. The author of *al-Shāfi* (the commentary of *al-Kāfī*) classified this narration as authentic. Refer to *al-Shāfi* 3/29

2 Al-Majlisī: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/73

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/271, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/68, al-Ṣaffār: *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* pg. 93

4 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/271, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/68, al-Ṣaffār: *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* pg. 93

5 Refer to *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/355

Another narration speaks about the types of revelations received by the Imām. In it, it is stated that Ja‘far said:

إن منا لمن ينكت في أذنه، وإن منا لمن يؤتى في منامه، وإن منا لمن يسمع صوت السلسلة تقع على الطشت (كذا)، وإن منا لمن يأتيه صورة أعظم من جبرائيل وميكائيل

From us, impressions are left in the ears of some, some see (revelation in their) dreams, some hear the sound of bells hitting against basins, and some are approached by figures greater than that of Jibrīl and Mikā‘īl.¹

Al-Biḥār has other narrations to corroborate this one.² It is as if they (the last group) have surpassed the Nabī, to whom Jibrīl would come to. This form, which is greater than Jibrīl and Mikā‘īl is al-Rūḥ³, as explained in other narrations. The author of *al-Kāfī* dedicated a chapter to this Rūḥ, titled, “al-Rūḥ, by which Allah directs the A‘immah”. This chapter consists of six narrations.⁴ Hereunder is one of those narrations:

عن أبي بصير قال: سألت أبا عبد الله عن قول الله تبارك وتعالى: وَكَذَلِكَ أَوْحَيْنَا إِلَيْكَ رُوحًا مِّنْ أَمْرِنَا مَّا كُنْتَ تَدْرِي مَا الْكِتَابُ وَلَا الْإِيمَانُ قال: خلق من خلق الله عز وجل أعظم من جبرائيل وميكائيل كان مع رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وآله - يخبره ويسدده وهو مع الأئمة من بعده

Abū Baṣīr says, “I asked Abū ‘Abd Allāh regarding the verse, ‘And thus We have revealed to you an inspiration of Our command. You did not know what is the Book or [what is] faith.’”⁵

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 36/358, *Baṣā‘ir al-Darajāt* pg. 63

2 Refer to *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/35 narrations 110, 111, 112, 113

3 *Ma‘ānī al-Akhbār* of Ibn Bābāwayh reports one definition of al-Rūḥ from the Imām. It is:

عمود من نور بيننا وبين الله عز وجل

A pillar of *nūr* (illumination) between us and Allah ﷻ.

‘Uyūn al-Akhbār pg. 354

4 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/273-274

5 *Sūrah al-Shūrā*: 52

He replied, “A creation from the creation of Allah, سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, who is greater than Jibrīl and Mīkā’īl. He would accompany Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, inform him and guide him. Thereafter, he remained with the Imāms.”¹

It is well-known that Rūḥ in this verse refers to the Qur’ān, hence the usage of the word, “We have revealed,” along with it. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى referred to it as Rūḥ (which literally means a soul) due to the fact that a purposeful life can only be lived by taking guidance from it.² It seems as if these claims of divine revelation upon their Imām escaped al-Mufīd (d. 413 A.H.), or, they were concocted later on. He states:

من يزعم أن أحداً بعد نبينا يوحى إليه فقد أخطأ وكفر

Whoever claims that anyone received revelation after our Nabī then indeed he has erred and he has committed kufr.³

The only other possibility is that he stated this on the basis of Taqīyyah. Thus far, we have learnt that the Imām receives divine inspiration, he hears the voice of an angel who visits his home and walks on his carpet, he sees the angel in his dreams, and an individual who is greater than Jibrīl and Mīkā’īl approaches him. However, this is not all. The Imām has other avenues as well, just as he possesses five souls. They are; the sanctified soul, the soul of īmān, the soul of life, the soul of strength, and the soul of desires.

The author of *al-Kāfī* mentions this under a chapter which he titled, “The chapter in which the souls of the Imāms are mentioned”.⁴ In this chapter, he quotes six narrations. Later, when the author of *Al-Biḥār* appeared on the scene, the number of these narrations were increased to seventy four.⁵ Their narrations emphasise

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/273

2 *Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwīyyah* pg. 4

3 *Awā’il al-Maḳālāt* pg. 39

4 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/271

5 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/47-99

the existence of *Rūḥ al-Quds* (the sanctified soul), which, according to them, is passed on to the Imāms after the demise of the *ambiyā'*. *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* states:

فإذا قبض النبي - صلى الله عليه وآله - انتقل روح القدس إلى الإمام

When Nabī ﷺ passed away, *Rūḥ al-Quds* moved on to the Imām.¹

Rūḥ al-Quds was the medium through which they learnt of everything, starting from below the 'Arsh, to below the ground.² He does not sleep, become negligent, engage in frivolities, or entertain false hopes, lies or mockery.³ By means of *Rūḥ al-Quds*, the Imām is able to see the following:

ما غاب عنه في أقطار الأرض وما في عنان السماء وبالجمل ما دون العرش إلى ما تحت الثرى

That which is hidden from him in the corners of the earth, that which is in the highest heavens, and everything from beneath the 'Arsh to below the ground.⁴

If you are amazed at what has been mentioned thus far, embrace yourself for what is next. The Imāms visit the 'Arsh of Allah, perform *ṭawāf* around it, and then take whatever knowledge they wish to take, every Friday. Abū 'Abd Allāh says:

إذا كان ليلة الجمعة وافى رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وآله - العرش ووافى الأئمة - عليهم السلام - معه ووافينا معهم، فلا ترد أرواحنا إلى أبداننا إلا بعلم مستفاد، ولولا ذلك لأنفذنا

On Thursday nights, Rasūlullāh ﷺ arrives at the 'Arsh and the Imāms arrive with him. We also arrive (there) with them. Our souls are not returned to our bodies, except with knowledge that is attained. Had it not been for that, we would have been exhausted.⁵

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/272

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/272

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/272

4 Al-Ghifārī: *Ta'ālīq 'alā Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/272

5 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/254, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/88-89, *Baṣā'ir al-Darqajāt* pg. 36

Other narrations, which support this one, are reported by al-Kulaynī under a chapter that he dedicated to this subject, titled, “The Imāms are increased on Thursday nights.” This chapter contains three narrations.¹ The author of *Biḥār* mentioned thirty seven of these narrations under the chapter, “They are increased and their souls ascend to the heavens.”² *Al-Biḥār* contains nineteen narrations in which it is mentioned that Allah ﷻ confided in ‘Alī, and that Jibrīl dictates to him.³ Similarly, seventeen narrations discuss the gifts and presents of Allah to ‘Alī.⁴ Al-Majlisī also mentions:

أن الله يرفع للإمام عموداً ينظر به إلى أعمال العباد

Allah lifts a pillar for the Imām by means of which he looks at the actions of the people.

To prove this, he quotes sixteen narrations.⁵ This is what they refer to as ‘new’ knowledge.⁶ The approval of the Imāms is a requisite for this knowledge to be given to them. This is established in the narrations of *al-Kāfī*, under the chapter titled, “The Imāms are taught when they wish to learn.”⁷ Three narrations are reported in this chapter, which state:

أن الإمام إذا شاء أن يعلم أعلم

When the Imām wishes to learn, he is taught.⁸

In other words:

إذ أراد الإمام أن يعلم شيئاً أعلمه الله ذلك

1 Refer to *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/253

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/86-97

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 39/151-157

4 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 39/118-129

5 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/132-136

6 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/264

7 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/258

8 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/258

When the Imām wishes to know something, Allah teaches that to him.¹

Alas! The revelation received by the Imām is not dependant on the decision of Allah alone, as is the case in the revelation received by the *ambiyā'*. Rather, it depends on the happiness and decision of the Imām! This knowledge of the Imāms, which they receive whenever they desire it, and it holds the same position as the speech of Allah and His Rasūl (according to the Shī'ah) is only a portion of their knowledge. They also have that which is referred to as *al-'Ilm al-Ghābir* or *al-'Ilm al-Mazbūr* (the preserved or ancient knowledge) in their narrations.² This is a reference to the books, scriptures, and knowledge that is placed in the care of the Imāms. It is the second basis on which they claim that the speech of the Imām is equal to the speech of Allah and His Rasūl. We will now discuss this.

The Second Principle; The Treasures of Knowledge and the Trusts of knowledge are by the Imāms

Al-Kāfī reports from Mūsā ibn Ja'far that he said (as they claim):

مبلغ علمنا على ثلاثة وجوه: ماضٍ وغابر وحادث، فأما الماضي فمفسّر، وأما الغابر فمزبور، وأما الحادث
فقدف في القلوب ونقر في الأسماع وهو أفضل علمنا ولا نبي بعد نبينا

Our knowledge consists of three parts: the past, the ancient, and the new. As for the past, it is explained. The ancient is that which is preserved and the new is that which is placed in the hearts or inscribed in the ears. This is the best of our knowledge, and there is no Nabī after our Nabī.³

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/258

2 Refer to *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/264

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/264

Another narration reports from their Imām:

أما الغابر فالعلم بما يكون، وأما المزبور فالعلم بما كان

As for the Ghābir, it is knowledge of that which will happen, and as for al-Mazbūr, it is knowledge of that which already happened. Refer to *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/18, al-Mufid: *Al-Irshād* pg. 257, al-Ṭabarsī: *al-Ihtijāj* pg. 203.

This explanation points out the subject matter of each type. One type is related to the happenings of the past, whilst the other is related to that which is to happen.

Al-Biḥār contains three narrations of this meaning.¹ The new knowledge is that which has already been explained. It is, as explained in the narration, their best knowledge. This is due to their belief, as explained by one of their scholars:

حصل لهم من الله بلا واسطة

Received by them from Allah, without any intermediary.²

This means that they receive this knowledge directly from Allah, without the intermediary of an angel. This is similar to the claims of the deviant Ṣūfīs.

As for the knowledge of the past, which is explained and the ancient which is preserved, this is explained by the commentator of *al-Kāfī*:

يعني: الماضي الذي تعلق علمنا به وهو كل ما كان مفسراً لنا بالتفسير النبوي، والغابر المزبور الذي تعلق علمنا به هو كل ما يكون مزبوراً مكتوباً عندنا بخط علي - رضي الله عنه - وإملاء الرسول وإملاء الملائكة مثل الجامعة وغيرها

This means the past, to which our knowledge is connected, is all that which was explained by Nabī ﷺ. The ancient and preserved is all that which was preserved by us from the writings of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and that which was dictated by the Rasūl and angels such as al-Jāmi‘ah and others.

Thus, we learn that the knowledge that is kept by the Imāms is of two types; books which they inherited from Nabī ﷺ or that which they received directly from him (face to face). The crux of this belief, which forms the core of their religion, is that Rasūlullāh ﷺ conveyed a portion of the Sharī‘ah and kept back a portion. He passed the hidden portion on to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, alone. ‘Alī, then conveyed a portion of it within his lifetime and passed on the remainder to Ḥasan at the time of his death. Similarly, each Imām conveyed a portion of it, according to the need, and passed on the rest to the one that was to come after him. The last portion now remains with the awaited one.

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/59, *Baṣā‘ir al-Darajāt* pg. 92

2 *Al-Māzindarānī: Sharḥ al-Jāmi‘* 6/44

We have already seen what their scholar and Āyat Allah Muḥammad ibn Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā (d. 1376 A.H.) had to say regarding the division of laws in Islam into two categories. One category was that which Nabī ﷺ openly preached to the Ṣaḥābah, and the other was that which he handed over to his awṣiyā'. Each Waṣī then brings out to the people that which they are in need of in his time. Thereafter, he passes it on to the one after him. He went on to say that at times Nabī ﷺ would mention a law without mentioning the specific case to which it applies, leaving this to the Imām of the time.¹

Their contemporary scholar, *Baḥr al-'Ulūm* says:

لما كان الكتاب العزيز متكفلاً بالقواعد العامة دون الدخول في تفصيلاتها، احتاجوا إلى سنة النبي.. والسنة لم يكمل بها التشريع!!، لأن كثيراً من الحوادث المستجدة لم تكن على عهده صلى الله عليه وسلم احتاج أن يدخر علمها عند أوصيائه ليؤدوها عنه في أوقاتها

Since the glorious book only covers the general laws, without going into the details, they were in need of the Sunnah of the Nabī... the Sharī'ah was not completed with the Sunnah, as there are many new happenings that did not take place in the era of Nabī ﷺ. He needed to place (the knowledge regarding this) in the care of his awṣiyā', so that they could convey it on his behalf, at the appropriate time.²

1 *Aṣl al-Shī'ah* pg. 77.

2 *Baḥr al-'Ulūm: Maṣābiḥ al-Uṣūl* pg. 4. There are many statements of their scholars which corroborate this. As an example, their greatest Āyat, Shihāb al-Dīn l-Najafī says:

إن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم ضاقت عليه الفرصة ولم يسعه المجال لتعليم جميع أحكام الدين.. وقد قَدَّمَ الاشتغال بالحروب على التمهصص (كذا) ببيان تفاصيل الأحكام.. لاسيما مع عدم كفاية استعداد الناس في زمنه لتلقي جميع ما يحتاج إليه طول قرون Nabī ﷺ did not have enough time and he did not have the opportunity to teach all the laws of dīn... he gave preference to engaging in war over delving into the explanation of the details of the laws... especially since the people of his era were not capable of absorbing all that was needed along the centuries. (al-Najafī: his footnotes on *Iḥqāq al-Haq* 2/288-289)

Look at how they insult Rasūlullāh ﷺ, by claiming that he preferred wars over conveying the laws of Allah. Allah says:

يَا أَيُّهَا الرُّسُولُ بَلِّغْ مَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكَ مِنْ رَبِّكَ

O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you from your Lord. Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 67

These are a few general outlines of this dangerous belief upheld by the Shī'ah. As for the proofs thereof, the discussion will lengthen unduly if all of them are reproduced. You can well imagine what will happen if they have to be scrutinised and analysed thereafter. Thus, we will quote some with brevity. The author of *al-Kāfī* has one chapter titled, "The Imāms are the guardians of the matters of Allah and they are the treasurers of His knowledge."¹ This chapter contains six narrations. A second chapter-heading reads, "The Imāms inherited the knowledge of Nabī ﷺ, all the ambiyā' before him and awṣiyā' before them."² This chapter contains seven narrations. A third chapter heading reads, "The Imāms know all the knowledge that came to the angels, ambiyā', and messengers."³ This chapter contains four narrations.

This preserved knowledge, as explained, is of two types (the explained and the preserved). As for the explained, among that which they have to say regarding it is that which is stated by the author of *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*, "Chapter: Allah ﷻ did not teach His Nabī anything, except that he commanded him to teach it to Amīr al-Mu'minīn, and he was his partner in knowledge". In this chapter, he narrates there narrations.⁴ Similar to this, is that which appears in *Al-Biḥār*, under the

continued from page 427

So did the Rasūl of guidance turn away from the command of his Rabb? Can these people (who make such derogatory statements regarding Rasūlullāh ﷺ) be among the followers of Nabī ﷺ, let alone his Ahl al-Bayt? Does their acceptance of this belief not demand that Allah be belied, as He said"

الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ وَأَتِمَمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ نِعْمَتِي وَرَضِيتُ لَكُمُ الْإِسْلَامَ دِينًا

This day I have perfected for you your religion and completed My favour upon you and have approved for you Islam as religion. Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 3

Allah ﷻ perfected for us the dīn. Thus, any statement which contradicts this is kufr and deviation. Yes, the religion which is incomplete, imperfect and will remain so till the end of times, is the religion of the Shī'ah. Their scholars keep adding and removing from it, and it has no shortage of contradictions. Why not, when it is a man-made-religion?

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/192-193

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/223-226

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/225-256

4 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/263

title, “He was a partner of Nabī ﷺ in knowledge, not nubuwwah, he was granted knowledge, every time Nabī ﷺ was granted knowledge, and he was more knowledgeable than all the ambiyā’”. This chapter contains twelve of their narrations.¹

Al-Majlisī also presents eighty two narrations regarding the knowledge of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. He tries to establish that Nabī ﷺ taught him a thousand chapters of knowledge. He dedicates a special chapter to this subject.² One of his narrations have it that Nabī ﷺ secretly taught ‘Alī رضي الله عنه a thousand narrations, which he did not teach the ummah. ‘Alī رضي الله عنه thereafter, made this known to the people saying:

أيها الناس، إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أسر إلي ألف حديث، في كل حديث ألف باب، لكل باب ألف مفتاح

O people! Rasūlullāh ﷺ secretly taught me a thousand narrations. Each narration has a thousand chapters and each chapter has a thousand keys.³

On another occasion, he claims that Abū ‘Abd Allāh said:

أوصى رسول الله - صلى الله عليه وآله - إلى علي - عليه السلام - بألف باب كل باب يفتح ألف باب

Rasūlullāh ﷺ passed on to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه a thousand chapters. Each chapter opens a thousand chapters.⁴

Thereafter, he claims that ‘Alī رضي الله عنه said:

إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله علمني ألف باب من الحلال والحرام، ومما كان ومما يكون إلى يوم القيامة، كل باب منها يفتح ألف باب فذلك ألف ألف باب، حتى علمت المنايا والبلايا، وفصل الخطاب

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 40/208-212

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 40/127-200

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 40/127, Ibn Bābāwayh: *al-Khiṣāl* 2/174

4 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 40/129, Ibn Bābāwayh: *al-Khiṣāl* 2/175-176

Rasūlullāh ﷺ taught me a thousand chapters regarding the lawful and unlawful and that which happened and which is going to happen until Qiyāmah. Each chapter of it opens a thousand chapters. Thus it is a million chapters. In this way, I have learnt the destinies, tragedies, and the decisive speech.¹

Another narration states that Rasūlullāh ﷺ venerated ‘Alī رضي الله عنه at the time of his death with his shirt and he narrated a thousand narrations to him, each of which opens a thousand chapters.² All of this, is not considered great knowledge by the Imāms. It is not as great as that which they have. Abū Baṣīr says:

دخلت على أبي عبد الله فقلت له: إن الشيعة يتحدثون أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله علم علياً باباً يفتح منه ألف باب، فقال أبو عبد الله عليه السلام: يا أبا محمد، علم والله رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله علياً ألف باب يفتح له من كل باب ألف باب: قلت له: هذا والله هو العلم. قال: إنه لعلم وليس بذلك

I entered upon Abū ‘Abd Allāh and said to him, “The Shī‘ah are saying that Rasūlullāh ﷺ taught ‘Alī a chapter from which a thousand chapters open up.”

Abū ‘Abd Allāh replied, “O Abū Muḥammad, by the oath of Allah, Rasūlullāh ﷺ taught ‘Alī a thousand chapters, from which each chapter opens up a thousand chapters.”

I commented, “By the oath of Allah, this is knowledge!”

He replied, “It is indeed knowledge, but it is not that great.”³

Nabī ﷺ continued teaching ‘Alī رضي الله عنه this secret knowledge (as claimed by the narrations of the Shī‘ah) as long as he lived. None besides him would get to

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 40/130, *al-Khiṣāl* 2/175, *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* pg. 87

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 40/215, *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* pg. 89-90

3 This is part of a lengthy narration which speaks about the imaginary types of knowledge possessed by the Imāms. Read up on it in *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/238, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 40/130, *al-Khiṣāl* 2/176-177

know of it. The lies of the Shī'ah regarding this are unbelievable. They go on to claim that 'Alī عليه السلام continued to receive knowledge from the mouth of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, even after his death. Al-Majlisī dedicated a chapter to this titled, "That which Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم taught him at the time of his demise and after that."¹

The first narration of this chapter states that 'Alī عليه السلام said:

اوصاني النبي صلى الله عليه وآله فقال: إذا أنا مت فغسلني بست قرب من بئر غرس فإذا فرغت من غسلي فأدرجني في أكفاني، ثم ضع فاك على فمي، قال: ففعلت وأنبأني بما هو كائن إلى يوم القيامة

Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم made his bequest to me saying, "When I pass away, bath me using six bags of water from the well of Ghars.² When you are done bathing me, place me in my coffin. Thereafter, place your mouth on my mouth."

He says, "I did this, whereupon he informed me of that which will happen until Qiyāmah."³

The second narration states that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم said, as they falsely claim:

يا علي، إذا أنا مت فاغسلني وكفني ثم أفعطني وساتلني واكتب

O 'Alī, when I pass away, bath me and place me in my coffin. Thereafter, make me sit, ask me and write.⁴

The rest of the narration continues to convey this laughable message. They go to the extent of saying that whenever 'Alī عليه السلام was told of anything, he would say:

هذا مما أخبرني به النبي صلى الله عليه وآله بعد موته

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 40/213-218

2 The well of Ghars: a well in al-Madīnah. Refer to *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 4/193, *Mu'jam Mā Usta'jam* 2/994, *al-Marāṣid* 2/988

3 *Bihār al-Anwār* 40/213, *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* pg. 80

4 *Bihār al-Anwār* 40/213, *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* pg. 80

This is from that which Nabī ﷺ informed me of after his demise.¹

This is how they destroy their own home, and expose their lies, by their exaggerations which have no limits. The above is only a fraction of their narrations regarding the knowledge that Nabī ﷺ passed on to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه alone, which was thereafter passed on to the Imāms who succeeded him. The imaginations of the Shī‘ah did not stop here. They went on to imagine that the Imāms possessed that which they referred to as the ancient knowledge or the books that they inherited from Nabī ﷺ.

The author of *al-Kāfī* mentioned a few of them under the chapter titled, “Mention of the Ṣaḥīfah, al-Jifr, al-Jāmi‘ah, and Muṣḥaf Fāṭimah ؑ”.² Another chapter is titled, “The greatest names of Allah that was granted to the Imāms.”³ A third chapter is titled, “The signs of the ambiyā’ that is possessed by the Imāms.”⁴ As for al-Majlisī, he mentioned many narrations regarding this. He gathered most of that which is found in their ‘reliable’ books in his *Biḥār*, under a number of chapters. It is difficult to cover all of them. A few of them are:

- The types of their knowledge and the books that they have (this chapter contains 149 narrations, which were he selected, as per his habit, from their most relied upon books.⁵)
- They have books in which the names of those kings who ruled the earth is mentioned.⁶
- They have the books of the ambiyā’ and they recite them in their different languages.⁷

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 40/215, *al-Kharā’ij wa l-Jarā’ih* pg. 132

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/238-242

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/330

4 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/231-232

5 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/18-66

6 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/155-156. This chapter contains 7 narrations.

7 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/180-189. This chapter contains 27 narrations.

- They have all the knowledge of the angels and ambiyā' and they have been given all that Allah granted to the ambiyā'.
- Each Imām has all the knowledge of the Imām before him, and the earth will not remain void of a knowledgeable person.¹
- They have a book in which the names of the people of Jannah, their Shī'ah, and their enemies are listed.²

The narrations of these chapters discuss the booklets and other things that the Imāms inherited. They also discuss the imaginary sources which the Rāfiḍah claim are in the possession of their Twelve Imāms, in which all that which the people require is mentioned (as they claim). If we have to present all that which is covered in these chapters, analyse their contents, highlight their contradictions, and the nonsense contained therein, we will need a separate chapter. Nonetheless, we will suffice upon indications and examples.

Many narrations of these chapters contained narrations regarding a booklet named, 'al-Jāmi'ah' – which they describe as:

سبعون ذراعاً بخط علي عليه السلام، وإملاء رسول الله صلى الله عليهما وعلى أولادهما - كذا - فيها
من كل حلال وحرام

Seventy cubits, in the handwriting of 'Alī عليه السلام, which was dictated by Rasūlullāh ﷺ. In it is everything permissible and impermissible.³

Every single matter has been covered in this, including the penalty for a scratch.⁴ Repeated mention is made of the knowledge contained therein, with a few variations in many narrations.⁵ It is indeed surprising that their Imāms promise

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/159-179. This chapter contains 63 narrations.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/117-132. This chapter contains 40 narrations.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/239, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/22

4 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/239, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/22

5 Refer to *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/22. Refer to the following narrations; 11, 13, 15, 17, 18, 22, 23 25, 61, 65, 78, 80, 90 etc.

their followers that they will judge on the basis of what is in these booklets, if they ever get the ability to pass judgments. They say:

لو ولينا الناس لحكمنا بما أنزل الله لم نعد ما في هذه الصحيفة

If we were given authority over the people, we would pass judgments on the basis of that which Allah revealed, we would not go beyond that which is in this booklet.¹

As for the Qurʾān, it is not mentioned. This booklet, as they explain, is their constitution. They say:

فنحن نتبع ما فيها ولا نعدوها

We follow whatever is in it, and we do not go beyond it.²

Abū Baṣīr (one of their narrators) claims that he saw this booklet in the possession of Abū Jaʿfar.³ Similarly, Zurārah claims that he heard a text from the texts in which it is stated:

إن ما يحدث به المرسلون كصوت السلسلة أو كمناجاة الرجل صاحبه

That by means of which the Messengers are communicated with, such as the sound of chains or the whispering of a person to his companion.⁴

Their narrations also have excerpts from that which they refer to as the book ‘Alī. They describe it as follows:

مثل فخذَي الرجل مطوًى

Like the folded thighs of a man.⁵

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/22-23, *Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt* pg. 39

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/22-23, *Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt* pg. 39

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/23, *Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt* pg. 39

4 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/24, *Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt* pg. 45

5 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/51, *Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt* pg. 45

And:

خط علي بيده وإملاء رسول الله

The writing of the hand of ‘Alī and the dictation of Rasūlullāh.¹

However, they have narrated to us nothing from these narrations, except their unjust law:

إن النساء ليس لهن من عقار الرجل إذا هو توفي عنها شيء، هذا والله خط علي بيده وإملاء رسول الله

Women are not entitled to anything from the land of a man if he passes away, leaving her behind. By the oath of Allah, this was with the handwriting of ‘Alī and the dictation of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.²

They hold firmly to this narration, which appears in their imaginary book, ignoring the verses of the Qur’ān, which do not differentiate between land and other possessions. If they insist on accepting this as a law, do they not realise that it contradicts their claims that Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was entitled to a share from Fadak?³ Nonetheless, it seems as if this book cannot be publicised except in an environment of irreligiousness. This is because, as soon as Mughīrah⁴ (who is classified in the books of the Rāfiḍah as well as an extremist) was killed, they paid more attention to hiding the book. Their Ja’far said (when a text was quoted to him regarding the Wilāyah of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه):

هذا مكتوب عندي في كتاب عليّ ولكن دفعته أمس حين كان هذا الخوف وهو حين صلب المغيرة

This is written (and) in my possession in the book of ‘Alī. However, I gave

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/51, *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* pg. 45

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/51, *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* pg. 45

3 They try to get out of this mess by claiming that Rasūlullāh ﷺ specified it for her during his blessed lifetime. Refer to *Muqtabas al-Athar* 23/179

4 Mughīrah ibn Sa’d al-Bajalī al-Kūfī, a heretic. His details passed on page 135 of this book.

it away yesterday on account of this fear, which was when Mughīrah was hanged.¹

Their narrations also have mention of a booklet (which contained nineteen booklets) which was presented or hidden away² by Rasūlullāh ﷺ by giving it to the Imāms.³ They mention nothing more than this. The narrations state:

في ذؤابة سيف علي صحيفة صغيرة، وأن علياً عليه السلام دعا إليه الحسن فدفعها إليه ودفع إليه سكيناً وقال له: افتحها، فلم يستطيع أن يفتحها ففتحها له، ثم قال له: اقرأ، فقرأ الحسن - عليه السلام - الألف والباء والسين واللام وحرفاً بعد حرف، ثم طواها فدفعها إلى الحسين عليه السلام فلم يقدر أن يفتحها، ففتحها له ثم قال له: اقرأ يا بُنَيَّ، فقرأها كما قرأ الحسن عليه السلام، ثم طواها فدفعها إلى ابن الحنفية فلم يقدر على أن يفتحها ففتحها له فقال له: اقرأ، فلم يستخرج منها شيئاً، فأخذها وطواها ثم علقها بذؤابة السيف

In the sheath of the sword of ‘Alī was a small booklet. He called Ḥasan, gave him a knife and said to him, “Open it.” He could not open it, so ‘Alī opened it for him and then said to him, “Read!” Ḥasan read, “Alif baa seen laam,” and alphabet after alphabet. Thereafter, he folded it and gave it to Ḥusayn, who could not open it. He opened it and said to him, Read, O my beloved son!” he read just as Ḥasan عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام read. Thereafter, he folded it and gave it to Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah. He could not open it, so ‘Alī opened it for him and said to him, “Read!” He could not make any sense of it. Thereupon, he took it, folded it and hanged it to the sheath of the sword.⁴

Abū ‘Abd Allāh was asked regarding the contents of this booklet. He answered:

هي الأحرف التي يفتح كل حرف ألف باب

It is those alphabets, each of which opens up a thousand chapters.⁵

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/52-53, *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* pg. 45. For more information regarding the supposed book of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, refer to *Al-Biḥār* 26/24, number 54, 55, and 59.

2 Some copies state ‘hidden’ and others state ‘presented’.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/24, *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* pg. 39

4 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/56, *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* pg. 89, al-Mufīd: *al-Ikhtisāṣ* pg. 284

5 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/56, *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* pg. 89, *al-Ikhtisāṣ* pg. 284

Abū ‘Abd Allāh عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام said:

فما خرج منها إلا حرفان الساعة

Until now, only two alphabets have emerged from it.¹

The exact meanings of these alphabets, which open up a thousand locked chapters, have not been explained in the above text. Nevertheless, the question that we would like an answer to is, why did the Imāms not use them? They, as claimed by the Shī‘ah, had to undergo unending difficulties and lived in fear, practicing Taqiyyah all the time, to the extent that the last of them, till now, is hidden away in his cave. He could not step out of it due to fear of the enemies all along the centuries.

Ibn Taymiyyah indicated towards a claim similar to this one, when he touched upon the idea of ‘calculating the total by means of the alphabets’. He states this is from that which was inherited from the Jews, and a certain sect attempted to calculate the amount of time left for the existence of this ummah by means of it.² Claims such as the previous one are similar to this one, and perhaps it also has a Jewish origin. It is nothing more than craziness and idiocy. It is a plot to unsettle the ummah and distract it from its important tasks. As for the commoners among the Shī‘ah, it dupes them and sinks them in riddles and puzzles which serve as a smokescreen to block off from the correct path. Engagement in its darkness does not allow them to find the straight path. Their claims of this nature are never ending.

They claim that ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said:

إن عندي صحفاً كثيرة.. وإن فيها لصحيفة يقال لها العبيطة، وما ورد عن العرب أشد عليهم منها، وإن فيها
لستين قبيلة من العرب بهرجة ما لها في دين الله من نصيب

1 ibid

2 *Fatāwā* 4/82 (gathered by ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Qāsim).

I have many booklets by me. Among them is a booklet called al-‘Abīṭah. It is the most severe narration against them. Sixty tribes of the Arabs have been exposed to be worthless. They do not have any portion in the dīn of Allah.¹

The reader might be able to pick up the agenda of the fabricator of this text and its likes. They are the products of hatred and racism towards the Arabs, not only on the basis of their nationality, but on account of the religion upheld and propagated by them as well. Since a vehicle was needed to spread this hatred, Shī‘ism was seen as the perfect target, and thus hijacked by these enemies of the Ummah and its dīn. Consequently, some sects of the Shī‘ah bought into the deception of these people and filled their books with these fairy-tales. Perhaps they done so knowingly. However, those who undergo the greatest losses are the followers, as they believe these tales on the basis of their ascription to the Ahl al-Bayt. Little do they know what is going on behind the scenes.

One of the books that they claim is in the possession of their Imāms is the book *Dīwān al-Shī‘ah* (or *al-Nāmūs* or *al-Simṭ*—the narrations differ as far as the name of the book is concerned). In this book, the names of every member of the Shī‘ah, along with his or her father’s name is recorded. The followers of the Imāms (as stated in their books) would go to the Imāms to find out if their names were in this book, as the appearance of a person’s name in this book guarantees salvation.²

As an example, they have a narration that records the visit of Abū ‘Abd Allāh by a woman named Ḥubābah al-Walibiyyah.

إن لي ابن أخ وهو يعرف فضلكم وإني أحب أن تعلمني أمن شيعتكم؟ قال: وما اسمه؟ قالت: فلان ابن فلان، قالت: فقال: يا فلانه، هاتي الناموس، فجاءت بصحيفة تحملها كبيرة فنشرها ثم نظر فيها فقال: نعم هو ذا اسمه واسم أبيه ها هنا

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/37, *Baṣā‘ir al-Darajāt* pg. 41

2 Refer to their narrations regarding this in *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/117-132

She said to him, “I have a nephew (brother’s son) who accepts that you people are virtuous. I would like to know if he belongs to your Shī’ah.”

He replied, “What is his name?”

She replied “Fulān, the son of fulān¹”

She reports, “He then said, ‘O fulānah, bring the Nāmūs.’”

Thus she brought a huge page, which he opened up and looked at.

Thereafter, he said, “Yes, his name as well as his father’s name is here.”²

According to them, whoever’s name is not recorded in this book is not from the Muslims, as their Imām said:

إن شيعتنا مكتوبون بأسمائهم وأسماء آبائهم.. ليس على ملة الإسلام غيرنا وغيرهم

Our follower’s names are written along with the names of their fathers.

Besides us and them, there are no followers of Islam.³

At times, they go on to claim that this was inherited from Rasūlullāh ﷺ. They believe that on the occasion of his ascension to the heavens, he was given two pages; one had the names of the *aṣḥāb al-yamīn* (people of the right) and the other had the names of the *aṣḥāb al-shimāl* (people of the left). These two pages had the names of the people of Jannah and the names of those who were destined for Jahannam as well. Thereafter, Rasūlullāh ﷺ—as they claim—gave it over to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. At present, it is in the hands of their awaited one.⁴

1 The word fulān in Arabic is used to refer to an unnamed person.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 26/121, *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* pg. 46

3 *Bihār al-Anwār* 26/123, *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* pg. 47

4 Refer to *Bihār al-Anwār* 26/124-125, *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* pg. 52. When we take into consideration their claims that the senior scholars among them communicate with him, we do not find it surprising that some of the Ayatollahs are believed to issue certificates of forgiveness and reports of failure (to the ‘unlucky ones’). They use these to fool their simple minded followers, and shove them into the thick of battle using these fake certificates.

The Imāms also have a book named, *Waṣīyyat al-Ḥusayn*, which contains all the needs of humans,¹ or all the needs of the children of Ādam since the inception of the world until its destruction.² Similarly, the Imāms have *al-Jifr al-Abyaḍ*³ (literally, the white fortune-teller). It contains, as they claim:

زبور داود، وتوراة موسى، وإنجيل عيسى، وصحف إبراهيم، والحلال والحرام، ومصحف فاطمة، وفيه ما
يتحتاج الناس؛ حتى إن فيه الجلدة، ونصف الجلدة، وثلاث الجلدة، وربيع الجلدة، وأرشد الخدش

The Psalms of Dāwūd, the Torah of Mūsā, the Bible of ʿĪsā, the pages of Ibrāhīm, the prohibited and allowed, the copy of Fāṭimah, and that which people are in need of. This is to the extent that it contains a strike of a whip, half a strike, one third of a strike as well as well as the compensation for a scratch.⁴

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 26/54, *Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt* pg. 54

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/304

3 The narrations define this:

وعاء من آدم فيه علم النبيين والوصيين، وعلم العلماء الذين مضوا من بني إسرائيل

A vessel made of leather, which contains the knowledge of the ambiyāʾ, awṣiyāʾ, and the scholars of the Banū Isrāʾīl. (*Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/239)

It is also described as:

جلد ثور ملى علماً

The skin of a bull, filled with knowledge. (*Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/241)

How can the Muslims be in need of a constitutional book other than the Qurʾān, when Allah perfected the dīn for us, terminated the revelation of divine books with the Qurʾān and abrogated all other religions by means of it? Allah says:

وَمَنْ يَبْتَغِ غَيْرَ الْإِسْلَامِ دِينًا فَلَنْ يُقْبَلَ مِنْهُ

And whoever desires other than Islam as religion – never will it be accepted from him. (Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 85)

Some of their narrations report different colours. Each colour is related to a topic relevant to it, and a smell that conforms to its shape. Thus, there is a red one, which contains the ‘red death’, and with which the awaited one will make his appearance. The Rāfiḍah have been threatened the former as well as the latter generations of the Muslims by means of the red one, as it has the made up story of the promised revenge that will take place. Refer to *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/240, *Faṣl al-Mahdiyyah wa al-Ghaybah*.

4 *Bihār al-Anwār* 26/37, *Baṣāʾir al-Darajāt* pg. 41

Analyses of this belief

We suffice upon the above quoted passages from the imaginary sources claimed by the Rāfiḍāh. A mere presentation of these are more than enough to prove their baseless nature. If any of them were in the least bit true, history would have been very different. The Imāms would not have failed to—as said by the Rāfiḍah—acquire the seats of authority, trials and difficulties would not have been their lot, every single one of them would not have passed away on account of poisoning or being murdered (as stated by the Rāfiḍah), and their hidden one would not have remained stuck in his cave, fearing that he will be killed if he emerges. These fairy-tales, which the Rāfiḍah have preserved in their reliable books, contain many dangerous ideas. A few of these will be highlighted in the chapters that follow.

The first idea that is imperative to highlight is the idea that divine revelation has not yet come to an end. This is undoubtedly a false belief, which is refuted by both, divine texts as well as logical proofs. Hence, the Muslims are unanimous that divine revelation was terminated upon the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and that revelation can only be received by a Nabī. Allah ﷻ himself says:

مَا كَانَ مُحَمَّدٌ أَبَا أَحَدٍ مِّن رِّجَالِكُمْ وَلَكِن رَّسُولَ اللَّهِ وَخَاتَمَ النَّبِيِّينَ

Muḥammad is not the father of [any] one of your men, but [he is] the Messenger of Allah and Seal [i.e., last] of the prophets.¹

Nahj al-Balāghah reports a statement of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه regarding Rasūlullāh ﷺ:

أرسله على حين فترة من الرسل.. فقفى به الرسل، وختم به الوحي

He (Allah) sent him after a period wherein there was no Nabī... he made him the last Rasūl and he terminated revelation with him.²

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 40

2 *Nahj al-Balāghah* pg., 191

This statement indicates that the previous claims were the products of the latter day scholars of the Shī'ah, who concocted them. As we have already seen, a classical scholar of theirs, al-Mufīd (d. 413 A.H.) declares the one who claims revelation in respect of anyone besides the ambiyā' to be a Kāfir. The second idea that we wish to highlight is claim that dīn is incomplete. This is in stark contradiction to the verse of Allah:

الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ..

This day I have perfected for you your religion...¹

This claim insinuates that the Rasūl of Guidance ﷺ did not convey all that was revealed to him, which implies that he did not fulfil the command of Allah who said:

يَا أَيُّهَا الرَّسُولُ بَلِّغْ مَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكَ مِنْ رَبِّكَ وَإِنْ لَمْ تَفْعَلْ فَمَا بَلَّغْتَ رِسَالَتَهُ

O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you from your Lord, and if you do not, then you have not conveyed His message.²

This is an insult to the honour of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. The result of this is that a sect of the Shī'ah have lost respect for Rasūlullāh ﷺ, and insult him.³ There is no doubt that Nabī ﷺ conveyed the message in the best possible manner, explained the dīn in detail, established the proofs required by all, and even announced this to the Muslims without concealing portion of the Sharī'ah from anyone. Allah ﷻ says:

لَتُبَيِّنَنَّ لِلنَّاسِ وَلَا تَكْتُمُونَهُ

You must make it clear [i.e., explain it] to the people and not conceal it.⁴

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 3

2 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 67

3 They are the al-'Albā'iyah. They will be discussed later.

4 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 187

This verse emphatically states that it is a message for the entire humanity and not just for a faction from the Ahl al-Bayt. Allah also says:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَكْتُمُونَ مَا أَنزَلْنَا مِنَ الْبَيِّنَاتِ وَالْهُدَىٰ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا بَيَّنَّاهُ لِلنَّاسِ فِي الْكِتَابِ أُولَٰئِكَ يَلْعَنُهُمُ اللَّهُ وَيَلْعَنُهُمُ اللَّاعِنُونَ إِلَّا الَّذِينَ تَابُوا وَأَصْلَحُوا وَبَيَّنُّوا

Indeed, those who conceal what We sent down of clear proofs and guidance after We made it clear for the people in the Scripture — those are cursed by Allah and cursed by those who curse. Except for those who repent and correct themselves and make evident [what they concealed].¹

In another verse Allah says:

وَمَا أَنزَلْنَا عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ إِلَّا لِتُبَيِّنَ لَهُمُ الَّذِي اخْتَلَفُوا فِيهِ

And We have not revealed to you the Book, [O Muḥammad], except for you to make clear to them that wherein they have differed.²

The crux of the message of these verses is that the dīn is complete. It will accept no additions deletions or modifications³, neither from a supposed Imām, nor from an imaginary individual who lives in occultation. Muḥammad ﷺ did not leave this world until he conveyed the entire dīn and explained all that needed to be explained, as Allah had commanded him, to all the Muslims. Thus, there is no secret portion of dīn that was confined to anyone.⁴ Rasūlullāh ﷺ said:

تركتكم على مثل البيضاء ليلها كنهارها لا يزيغ عنها بعدي إلا هالك

I left you on a clear path, the night of it is the same as the day. None will

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 159-160

2 Surah al-Naḥl: 64

3 Ibn Ḥazm: *al-Muḥallā* 1/26

4 Ibn Ḥazm: *al-Muḥallā* 1/15

digress from it after me (my demise) except the one who is destroyed.¹

Abū al-Dardā رضي الله عنه said:

صدق الله ورسوله فقد تركنا على مثل البيضاء

Allah and His Rasūl have spoken the truth. Indeed we have been left on a clear path.²

Abū Dharr al-Ghifārī رضي الله عنه said:

قد تركنا محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم وما يحرك طائر جناحيه في السماء إلا ذكر لنا منه علماً

Muḥammad صلى الله عليه وسلم left us in a state that even if a bird flaps its wings in the skies, some knowledge regarding that has been mentioned to us.³

‘Umar رضي الله عنه said

قام فينا رسول الله مقاماً فأخبرنا عن بدء الخلق حتى دخل أهل الجنة منازلهم وأهل النار منازلهم حفظ ذلك من حفظه ونسيه من نسيه

Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم stood up amongst us and informed us regarding (everything, from) the beginning of creation until the people of Jannah enter the dwellings and the people of hell take their positions. Some remember it while others have forgotten it.⁴

1 This is a portion of a ḥadīth reported by Ibn Mājah in his *Sunan* (al-Muqaddimah, Bāb Ittibā’ al-Khulafā’ a-Rāhidīn 1/16), Aḥmad in his *Musnad* 4/126, al-Ḥākim in his *al-Mustadrak* 1/96, Ibn Abī ‘Aṣim in *Kitāb al-Sunnah*. Further, many authentic narrations have been reported conveying the same meaning as this ḥadīth.

2 Ibn Abī ‘Aṣim in *Kitāb al-Sunnah* 1/26

3 *Musnad Aḥmad* 5/153

Allah says, “Do they not see the birds above them with wings outspread and [sometimes] folded in? None holds them [aloft] except the Most Merciful. Indeed He is, of all things, Seeing.” Sūrah al-Mulk: 19.

4 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* 4/73 (Kitāb Bad’ al-Khalq)

Imām al-Shāfi‘ī says:

No situation comes upon the one who follows the dīn of Allah, except that the Book of Allah contains guidelines regarding it.¹

Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq (as stated in the books of the Shī‘ah) said:

إن الله تعالى أنزل في القرآن تبيان كل شيء حتى والله ما ترك الله شيئاً يحتاج إليه العباد حتى لا يستطيع عبد يقول: لو كان هذا أنزل في القرآن؟ إلا وقد أنزل الله فيه

Allah revealed in the Qur’ān the explanation of everything. By the oath of Allah, he did not omit anything that is needed by the servants, so that no servant may say, “If only this was revealed in the Qur’ān,” except that Allah it revealed therein.²

Now who is lying, as there is a clear contradiction between this statement and the narrations quoted previously? It is obviously that it is the Shī‘ah. The Rāfiḍah are totally misguided in their opposition of this foundational belief, which is ‘the absolute fundamental principle of knowledge and īmān, to the extent that the one who holds most firmly to it will be closest to the truth in knowledge and practise.’³

Where are these pages and booklets of theirs? What stops their awaited one, in this day and age, from bringing it out to the masses? Do people need it for their dīn? If yes, then why was the ummah kept away from their source of guidance for more than one thousand one hundred years (since the imaginary Imām disappeared)? All of these generations committed no crime, due to which they have been deprived of these ‘blessings’ and treasures!

Conversely, if they do not need it for their dīn, then why were all the above claims made? Also, why then do the Shī‘ah turn away from the actual sources of

1 *Al-Risālah* pg. 20

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/59

3 *Ma‘ārij al-Wuṣūl* pg. 2, *Muwāfaqat Ṣaḥīḥ al-Manqūl* 1/13

guidance, i.e. the Qur'ān and Sunnah? The truth, which simply cannot be doubted is that Allah perfected for us our dīn, as He said, “This day I have perfected for you your religion...”¹ if any claims are made contrary to this, it will obviously be lies and baseless propaganda.

The purpose behind concocting all of these narrations was to establish the beliefs of this sect regarding the Imāms, and therefore they did not keep any limits in doing so. The result is that they have exposed themselves. If anything goes beyond its boundaries, it becomes volatile and the result ends up being the opposite of that which was intended. If ‘Alī عليه السلام did have any such knowledge, he would have narrated to the people during his Khilāfah, and the Ahl al-Sunnah would have also reported it. It would not have been confined to a handful of the Rāfiḍah.

These claims were first made during the days of his Khilāfah, primarily by members of the Saba’iyyah, as is reported in *Risālat al-Irjā* of Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥanafiyyah, as already stated. Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī عليه السلام rejected these claims most vehemently, and he informed the Muslim public regarding this. He rejected the notion that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم secretly passed on to them something and made them alone, excluding the rest of the Muslims, the custodians thereof.

‘Alī عليه السلام added extra weight to his declaration by stating it after taking an oath on Allah. It is as if he knew and feared that some people will appear later and try to play it down by claiming that it was done out of Taqiyyah. Thus, by taking an oath, he made his statement indisputable, so that whoever wishes to be destroyed (by rejecting it) will be destroyed after sufficient proof was made available to him and similarly, the one who wishes to be saved will have total satisfaction that he is upon the correct path. This was from the foresight of the first battalion of Islam, who accrued this by accompanying Muḥammad صلى الله عليه وسلم, learning from him and doing Jihād at his side. The ḥadīth regarding this rejection is recorded in the *Ṣiḥāḥ*, *Sunan* and *Masānīd*.²

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 3

2 The details have passed in page 103 - 104 of this book.

The books of the Shī'ah have also preserved this ḥadīth. *Tafsīr al-ṣāfi* reports:

أنه عليه السلام سئل هل عندكم من رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم شيء من الوحي سوى القرآن؟ قال: لا، والذي فلق الحبة وبرأ النسمة إلا أن يعطى العبد فهماً في كتابه

‘Alī was asked, “Do you people have anything from Rasūlullāh ﷺ that was waḥī besides the Qur’ān?”

He replied, “By the one who split the seed and purified the air, No! Except that understanding that a slave is given of His book.”¹

These claims were then increased and amplified during the eras of Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq and his father ﷺ. Each Shī‘ī sect took their share of these claims. However, the Twelvers gathered that which was taken by all the different sects and then added on to it as the years passed. Ibn Taymiyyah indicated towards these stances of the Shī‘ah and their attribution of these imaginary items, such as the Jifr, to some of the Ahl al-Bayt. However, he did not confine this to the Twelvers. Rather, he attributed the belief that ‘Alī ﷺ was granted secret knowledge (which opposes the apparent meanings of texts) to the Qarāmīṭah Bāṭiniyyah.² Similarly, he attributed the view that ‘Alī ﷺ knows the details of the future to the extremist Shī‘ah.³

Shaykh Abū Zahrah is of the view that the Khaṭṭābiyyah were the first to claim the existence of the Jifr. He deduced this from the statement of al-Maqrīzī.⁴ Added to that, the Shī‘ī books have statements which support this. They state that Abū al-Khaṭṭāb is the one who attributed knowledge of the unseen to Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq, who belied and denounced him. He then enumerated a few examples wherein knowledge regarding certain things had escaped him in his life, even though it

1 *Tafsīr al-ṣāfi* 1/19

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/179

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/179

4 *Al-Imām al-Ṣādiq* pg. 126

was not beyond his reach to learn about them. His position was the same as the rest of humanity, as far as this was concerned. We will reproduce his exact words later.

These claims are further refuted by the lives of the Imāms. They acquired knowledge, like everyone else, from humans. Whoever reads up their biographies will see this very clearly, without any difficulty.¹ The most reliable of the Shī'ī books on the subject of narrators, *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, confirms that Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn narrated from Jābir ibn 'Abd Allāh رضي الله عنه. However, they present an ultra-flimsy excuse for this saying, "He narrated from him so that people could believe him."² This excuse ridicules all the other claims regarding the Imāms, who are believed to possess knowledge and supernatural abilities which grant them control over the hearts and minds of people. Added to that, why would the people not believe them when they are from the progeny of the Rasūl صلى الله عليه وسلم?

If Amīr al-Mu'minīn possessed some of the knowledge that they claim, he would have planned the matters of his Khilāfah differently. He definitely did not have the kind of knowledge that they attribute to him, as he regretted some of that which he did.³ The Shī'ah state that Ḥusayn's رضي الله عنه going to Kūfah, the treachery of its people towards him, and his assassination was on account of everybody—besides three—turning renegade.⁴ If he really had knowledge of the future, he would not have went at all, or he would have gone to other people.

1 As examples;

'Alī ibn Ḥusayn studied under Jābir, Anas, the Ummahāt al-Mu'minīn: 'Ā'ishah, Umm Salamah, and Ṣāfiyyah, as well as Ibn 'Abbās, Miswar ibn Makhramah, Abū Rāfi' (the freed slave of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم), Marwān ibn Ḥakam, Sa'd ibn al-Musayyab, and others from the 'ulamā' of Madīnah. *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/153, 4/144.

Ḥasan رضي الله عنه studied under his father as well as others, including some of the Tābi'īn. This was the result of his great understanding and piety. *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/144. The same was the condition of all the 'ulamā' of the Ahl al-Bayt.

2 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 28

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/180

4 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 2/280, *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 123

The books of the Shī'ah have it recorded that Ja'far رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ distanced himself from these extremists and their fanaticism. He rejected the knowledge of the unseen which Abū al-Khaṭṭāb attributed to him, after taking numerous oaths. He then further established this by presenting examples from his life which proved this. He said:

لقد قاسمت مع عبد الله بن الحسن حائطاً بيني وبينه فأصابه السهل والشرب، وأصابني الجبل

I divided a garden between myself and 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥasan. He received the flat portion with water, whilst I received the mountain (uneven land).¹

He also said:

يا عجباً لأقوام يزعمون أنا نعلم الغيب، ما يعلم الغيب إلا الله، لقد هممت بضرب جاريتي فلانة فهربت مني فما عملت في أي بيوت الدار هي

How strange it is that some people claim that we know the unseen. None knows the unseen except Allah. I intended to hit a certain slave girl of mine, but she ran away from me and I did not even know in which room of the house she was.²

Their lives were the greatest proof that this belief is nothing but pure drivel, as they were no different from the rest of humanity. They would forget and commit errors. The engineers of Shī'ism invented two mechanisms by means of which they get themselves out of this, viz. Taqiyyah and Badā. If the Imāms answer to a question was incorrect, they used Taqiyyah and if he supposedly informed regarding an event, which turned out against that which he said, they claimed that Badā took place by Allah مُجِبَّاتُهُ وَتَعَالَى.³

At times it is said that these fairy-tales are mere narrations which have no practical consequences as the Imāms no longer exist. They are merely preserved in the

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 188-189 (Iranian print), *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/322

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/257

3 Refer to the chapters regarding Taqiyyah and Badā.

books of the Shī'ah to highlight their deviant ideas. However, I am of the opinion that these blatant lies do have dangerous consequences upon the attitude and mentality of the gullible followers. It leads those who allow their minds to give it some thought towards the worst types of disbelief. Similarly, this extremism, at times, adopts a practical form which can be noted from the extremism that takes place at the graves of the Imāms.

A third problem that is created by this idea is that they believe (as will appear in detail under the discussion of Imāmah) that their Ayatollahs and scholars are deputies of the absent ones and they are his representatives among the people. They are believed to be in contact with this "Hidden One", who makes himself apparent to some of them, as they claim. Thus, they are claims which have real and practical consequences, which are central to the Shī'ī doctrine. This will be discussed in detail in the next discussion, the narratives of al-Riqā' (the notes).

The Narratives of al-Riqā'

Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī عليه السلام—who the Shīʿah take as their eleventh Imām—passed away in the year 260 A.H, leaving behind no offspring¹. This fact is admitted in the books of the Shīʿah, and the most reliable historians have also recorded it.² The roots of Shīʿism were shaken by this reality just as it signalled their end, as the foundation of their religion is the Imām, whose words—according to them—holds the same weight as the speech of Allah and His Rasūl.

Since the Imām passed away without any offspring, he left them without anyone to hold on to. Hence, in the year 260 A.H, divine speech was halted. This also resulted in the termination of the cash-flow, which was collected from the followers in the name of the Imām. Consequently, the Shīʿah were divided, their affairs were uncertain, they were condemned and the matter became really difficult for them, as will appear.³

However, this sect—who have made it their responsibility to divide the ummah—began stitching up their patches and worked their way around the situation so that they could keep alive the beliefs of Shīʿism and thereby continue harming the ummah. It was also the tool used by them to devour the wealth of the gullible and simple minded followers in the easiest possible manner, and to gain status and popularity amongst them.

Thus, they made the most preposterous claim, i.e. Ḥasan had a child who hid away, and therefore none got to know him. The reason why he went into hiding was that he feared that he would be killed, even though his father and grandfather and their ancestors were not killed by the state. It is unknown how this fear gripped

1

ولم يعرف له خلف ولم ير له ولد ظاهر

“He was not known to have any offspring and no son of his was seen.”

Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq pg. 102

2 Refer to *al-Muntaqā* pg. 31

3 The details will appear under the chapter of Ghaybah.

him, especially since he was only child and the adults in his family were left to live. Why would anyone leave the adults and kill a new-born child?

This lie, despite its obvious fallaciousness, delighted the scholars of the Shī'ah. Subsequently, they began spreading it among their followers. The result was that this belief penetrated the sectarian Shī'ī circles in the most complete manner. Thereafter, the scholars began differing regarding being his deputies, with each of them producing a signed letter from this child wherein the other scholars were cursed and it was stated that the possessor of the letter was the actual representative.

Many claimants then began arriving at the scene, each wanting to be the representative of the Imām, which would entitle him to dupe the masses into handing over their hard-earned cash to him. The Twelvers, however, accepted four of these claimants as the deputies of the awaited one. They would collect money on behalf of this child, forward questions and requests of the people to him and bring back to them, in a very secretive manner, answers and correspondences which they claimed were in the hand-writing of this child. They also set a date for his public appearance, so that they would not be doubted and belied. However, when that generation passed, they presented the excuse, "Badā took place by Allah and now there is no date set for his appearance."¹

These unknown letters, which were the products of the hands of this conniving clique—which are attributed to the imaginary child—are regarded by the Shī'ah as the most reliable narrations and the texts which hold the most weight. They refer to them as *al-Tawqī'āt*, which is the name given to the so called letters of the Imāms regarding the matters of the Shī'ah. It seems as if sectarianism and fanaticism for one's group deprives the brain of doing its functions. The thinking capacity of a person is stunned and paralyzed by means of it. How else would it be possible for this sect to grant a child like this the authority to dictate the Sharī'ah? How else would they equate him to the ambiyā'? If he really did exist,

1 Further details will appear under the chapter of Ghaybah.

at that stage he was to be taken care of by his guardian. Amazingly, Sharī'ah was narrated from this child from the moment that he was born!

Have a look at a narration of the one who they refer to as al-Ṣadūq, Ibn Bābāwayh al-Qummī, from a female named Nasīm (who they claim is the servant of the toddler). She said:

قال لي صاحب الزمان وقد دخلت عليه بعد مولده ليلة فعضت عنده فقال لي: رحمك الله، قالت نسيم:
ففرحت بذلك، فقال لي - عليه السلام -: ألا أبشرك في العطاس؟ قلت: بلى يا مولاي، قال: هو أمان
من الموت ثلاثة أيام

The master of the era said to me (since I walked into his presence a night after his birth and sneezed), “May Allah have mercy upon you.”

I was elated by this, so he عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام said to me, “Should I not give you glad-tidings regarding the sneeze?”

I replied, ‘Please do, o my master!’

He responded, “It is a protection from death for a period of three days.”¹

This text is reported by one of their greatest scholars, who considers this to be from the Sunnah of the infallibles and he equates it to the statements of Allah and His Rasūl. These lies were spread by a group of these fraudsters, who claimed to be in communication with the awaited one. This sect accepted four of them, as explained. The period in which these deputies claimed correspondence with the Imām is referred to as *al-Ghaybah al-Ṣuġhrā* (the minor occultation), which continued for approximately seventy years. Each of the Islamic countries had a few representatives of these deputies, who would ensure that the money of their followers reached them and in return, they would produce these forged letters.

The scholars of the Shī'ah have paid great attention to these letters, and they have preserved them in their most important books, believing that they are from

1 *Ikmal al-Dīn* pg. 406, 407 and 416

waḥī, which cannot be affected by falsehood in any way. To name a few, al-Kulaynī does so in *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*¹, Ibn Bābāwayh in *Ikmāl al-Dīn*², al-Ṭūsī in *al-Ghaybah*³, al-Ṭabarsī in *al-Iḥtijāj*,⁴ and al-Majlisī in *Al-Biḥār*⁵. Their scholar, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Jā‘far al-Ḥimyarī gathered the narrations from the awaited one in a book which he named *Qurb al-Isnād*,⁶ and the author of *Al-Dharī‘ah* listed two books of theirs on this subject named *al-Tawqī‘āt al-Khārijah min al-Nāḥiyah al-Muqaddasah*.⁷

These notes or letters contain the views of the Imām regarding many matters relating to dīn and life. They portray him as one who had access to the knowledge of the unseen, one who fulfilled the wishes of the Shī‘ah, cured their ill ones, solved their problems, answered their questions and blessed the wealth that they sent for him with acceptance. At times, these are all presented in the form of a narrative.

If a reader ponders over the verdicts ascribed to him as far as the matters of dīn are concerned, he will see gross ignorance regarding the basic matters of the Sharī‘ah, which indicates that either the one who fabricated these letters was a very ignorant bigot who could not even fabricate properly, or Allah ﷻ wished to expose and disgrace them in a way that all and sundry may understand. Thus, their attempts and likes were akin to the attempts of Musaylamah’s, the imposter, attempts at producing the like of the Qur’ān.

Have a look at the contents of one of these letters. You may witness the falsity for yourself:

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/517

2 *Ikmāl al-Dīn* pg. 450

3 *Al-Ghaybah* pg. 172

4 *al-Iḥtijāj* 2/277

5 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 53/150-246

6 This book was printed by al-Maṭba‘ah al-Islāmiyyah in Tehran.

7 Aghā Buzurg Tahrānī: *Al-Dharī‘ah Ilā Taṣānīf al-Shī‘ah* 4/500-501

وكتب إليه صلوات الله عليه أيضاً في سنة ثمان وثلاثمائة كتاباً سأل فيه عن مسائل .. سأل عن الأبرص والمجذوم وصاحب الفالج هل يجوز شهادتهم؟ فأجاب عليه السلام: إن كان ما بهم حادث جازت شهادتهم، وإن كانت ولادة لم تجز

He wrote a letter to him عليه السلام in the year 308, asking him regarding a few matters... He asked if the testament of the bald one, the leper, and the semi-paralyzed could be accepted.

He عليه السلام replied, “If it is affected them (after birth) then their testimony will be accepted, but if they were born like that, then it will not be accepted.”¹

How can baldness and its likes have any effect on the acceptance or rejection of testimonies? Can there be any rationale to the difference that was stated between the one who was born with the illness and the one who was affected by it at a later stage? Does a verdict such as this one deserve any attention? How can something so ludicrous be attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt or to Islam? Another letter states that he was asked, ‘Is it permissible for a person to count his tasbīḥ (glorification of Allah) using beads that are made from the sand of a grave and is there any virtue attached to this?’ He replied:

يسبح به فما من شيء من التسبيح أفضل منه، ومن فضله أن الرجل ينسى التسبيح ويدير السبحة فيكتب له التسبيح

He should use it to count. There is nothing more virtuous than it for counting the tasbīḥ. Among its virtues is that if a man forgets his count and then rotates the beads, he will receive the reward of tasbīḥ.²

This ideology belongs to the religion of the idolaters, not the religion of the monotheists. They receive rewards for playing with beads. Which Sharī‘ah says this, and which scholar will issue such a verdict? There are many other examples

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 53/164

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 53/165

of this kind of foolish and baseless verdicts.¹

This ‘Sunnah’, which is uttered by this awaited one, contains narratives of the unseen, and supernatural abilities by means of which many hopes turn into realities. A certain Shī‘ī, who was afflicted by a chronic illness, such that the doctors gave up hope of him recovering, turns to this “Imām” through the medium of his representatives and writes a letter in which he asks to be cured. A signed letter is returned to him, which includes a prayer for him to be cured. He did not even have to wait for a week to pass before he was cured.²

1 On another occasion he was asked if a person is allowed to prostrate upon a grave. He replied:

والذي عليه العمل أن يضع خده الأيمن على القبر، وأما الصلاة فإنها خلفه ويجعل القبر أمامه

The practise is to place the right cheek upon the grave. As for ṣalāh, it should be performed behind it, and the grave should be in front of it. *Biḥār al-Anwār* 53/165.

How can a person make the grave his Qiblah? Why would anyone soil his cheeks with the sand of the grave? Muslims are commanded to face the House of Allah, and to prostrate to Allah alone. Curses have been narrated regarding those who take the graves as places of prostration. The following question is among that, regarding which they claim was posed to the awaited one, followed by a signed answer from him:

قد اختلف أصحابنا في مهر المرأة فقال بعضهم: إذا دخل بها سقط المهر، ولا شيء لها، وقال بعضهم: هو لازم في الدنيا والآخرة، فكيف ذلك؟ وما الذي يجب فيه؟ فأجاب عليه السلام: إن كان عليه بالمهر كتاب فيه دين، فهو لازم له في الدنيا والآخرة، وإن كان عليه كتاب فيه ذكر الصدقات سقط إذا دخل بها، وإن لم يكن عليه كتاب فإذا دخل بها سقط في الصدقات

Our scholars have differed regarding the dowry of a woman. Some of them said, ‘When he has intercourse with her, the dowry falls away and she will not deserve anything.’ Others say, ‘It is binding in this world as well as the hereafter.’ How is this possible? What is necessary?

He replied, “If it recorded on as a debt as far as the dowry is concerned, it will be compulsory upon him in this world as well as the hereafter, if it is written on a document with charities, it will fall away once he has intercourse with her, and if it is not recorded anywhere, the remainder of the dowry will fall away when he has intercourse with her.” *Biḥār al-Anwār* 53/169

Can an answer like this come out of the mouth of a scholar? Even an ignorant person who has some bit of sense will not utter such nonsense. This ideology, undoubtedly, has nothing to do with Islam. How can a person lose his or her wealth simply because there is no document wherein their right to it was recorded? The dowry, as stated above, falls away if it is not recorded! This is the constitution of thugs and anarchists, not the Sharī‘ah of Islam. If anyone wishes to see more of these examples, he may refer to *Biḥār al-Anwār* pg. 53, *Ikmal al-Dīn* of Ibn Bābāwayh and *al-Ghaybah* of al-Ṭūsī.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/519

Another man has a wife who is barren. His longing and desire to have children reached its peak, thus he writes to the sacred chamber.¹ The response is a signed letter stating that his wife will give birth before the passing of four months and the child will be a boy.² They even learn their dates of death from this toddler. One Shī'ī wrote to him requesting a burial garment. The reply in the letter was:

إنك تحتاج إليه في سنة ثمانين، فمات في سنة ثمانين وبعث إليه بالكفن قبل موته بأيام

“You will need it in the year 80.” Thus, he died in the year 80 and a burial garment was sent to him a few days prior to his death.³

Some of these letters indicate that upholding the practices of Islam cannot be done without the permission of this hidden individual. It is as if the ‘Sunnah’ contained in these letters hold more weight than the texts of Islam according to the Shī'ah. This can be understood from the following texts:

ولد لي مولود فكتبت أستأذن في تطهيره يوم السابع. فلم يكتب شيئاً فمات المولود يوم الثامن ..

A child was born to me, so I wrote seeking permission to cleanse him on the seventh day. Nothing was written (in reply), so the child died on the eighth day.⁴

This person waited for the permission of the Imām to circumcise his son. Another narration indicates that marriage takes place, in most cases, after the Imām instructs that it should take place. One of them says:

زوجت بأمره سرّاً فلما وطئتها علقت وجاءت بابنة فاغتممت وضاق صدري فكتبت أشكو ذلك (يعني في رسالة إلى هذا الطفل المنتظر) فورد: ستكفأها، فعاشت أربع سنين ثم ماتت فورد: الله ذو أناة وأنتم تستعجلون

1 A reference to their Mahdī.

2 *Ikmāl al-Dīn* pg. 460

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/524, *Ikmāl al-Dīn* pg. 465, 467

4 Ibn Bābāwayh: *Ikmāl al-Dīn* pg. 465

I married a concubine on his instruction,. After I had intercourse with her, and she gave birth to a girl, I was greatly saddened and anguished. I wrote (to this awaited Mahdī), complaining (about my situation).

The reply was, “You will be sufficed regarding her.”

She lived on for four years and then died.

Thereupon, it was stated, “Allah is patient but you people hurry.”¹

Ḥajj depends on the permission of this “child”. One Shīrī reports:

تهيأت للحج، وودعت الناس، وكنت - كذا - على الخروج فورد: نحن لذلك كارهون، والأمر إليك، قال: فضايق صدري واغتممت وكتبت: أنا مقيم على السمع والطاعة غير أنني معتم بتنخلفي عن الحج، فوق: لا يضيقن صدرك فإنك ستحج من قابل إن شاء الله، قال: ولما كان من قابل كتبت أستأذن، فورد الإذن

I prepared for Ḥajj and I bid farewell to the people. I was about to leave when it (the letter) came, “We dislike that, but the matter is for you to decide.”

1 Ibid.

Take note that this infallible Mahdī did not have anything to say regarding the agony and grief of the one who complained, even though this was in reality, from the customs of the people of Jāhiliyyah. Allah says regarding them:

وَإِذَا بُشِّرَ أَحَدُهُم بِالْأُنثَىٰ ظَلَّ وَجْهُهُ مُسْوَدًّا وَهُوَ كَظِيمٌ

And when one of them is informed of [the birth of] a female, his face becomes dark, and he suppresses grief. (Sūrah al-Naḥl: 58)

He was greatly worried regarding her sustenance, even though Allah is the one who is responsible for sustenance. He said:

وَلَا تَقْتُلُوا أَوْلَادَكُمْ خَشْيَةَ إِمْلَاقٍ نَحْنُ نَرْزُقُهُمْ وَإِيَّاكُمْ

And do not kill your children for fear of poverty. We provide for them and for you. (Sūrah al-Isrā: 31)

The awaited one, on the other hand, considered death to be the way out.

Thereupon, I was disheartened and saddened so I wrote, “I am listening and obeying, so I will stay behind. However, I am grieved due to being left behind from Ḥajj.”

The reply was, “Do not grieve, as you will perform Ḥajj next year if Allah wills.”

When I wrote the next year, seeking permission, it was granted.¹

Is the command of their Imām above the command of Allah and His Sharī‘ah that they have to be given permission by him before they can carry out one of the fundamentals of Islam? These letters, despite their ridiculous contents, hold a very special position in the eyes of the Shī‘ī scholars. Hence, they grant precedence to them over that which is narrated in their books with that which they refer to as authentic isnāds when there is a contradiction. Ibn Bābāwayh, after speaking about the letters from the sacred chamber in his book *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh*, under the chapter “Two men who have been bequeathed” says:

هذا التوقيع عندي بخط أبي محمد الحسن بن علي، ثم ذكر أن في الكافي للكليني رواية بخلاف ذلك التوقيع عن الصادق، ثم قال: “لست أفتي بهذا الحديث بل أفتي بما عندي بخط الحسن بن علي..”

This letter is by me in the writing of Abū Muḥammad Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī. Thereafter, he mentioned in *al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī there is a narration from al-Ṣādiq that contradicts that letter. He then says, “I will not pass a verdict according to this ḥadīth. Rather, I will pass a verdict based on what is by me in the writing of Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī.”

Al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī commented on this saying:

.. فإن خط المعصوم أقوى من النقل بوسائط

The hand-writing of the infallible one holds more weight than narrations in many different ways.

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/522

How are they so sure that this was the hand-writing of the Ḥasan or the awaited one (who was not even born), even though hand-writings are similar? What makes them believe that these were from him, when there are so many lies attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt? In order to accept this, they rely upon one who is not infallible (i.e. the deputy of the Imām), whereas infallibility is from their primary principles. Added to that, the post of being the deputy is highly questionable, as many of their leading figures attempted to secure this post for himself, as it is the easiest way to collect wealth.

It seems as if the one who opened this door for the Shī'ah was an expert thief who mastered the art of lying and donned the garment of hypocrisy in order to plot against the Muslims, lead people astray and earn a great deal of wealth. However, the reports of this single person, who was not even considered infallible (but rather, unreliable), became the most authentic texts according to their scholars. Consequently, they grant precedence to these letters over that which appears in their most authentic books. Furthermore, whoever claims to have had contact with this Imām, or to have written to him, secures himself the trust of his sect (even though this is the greatest proof, in the light of history and logic that they are liars), as is apparent from their books on narrators.¹

These letters also contain disparagement and commendation of people or narrators, which are then considered to be the basis of their approval or disapproval of any individual.² Thus, they serve as a pivotal source of their dīn. Al-Ālūsī says:

They formed their religion on the basis of notes, which are such that no man of intellect will doubt that they are forgeries against Allah ﷻ. None will accept them except those whose sight and foresight have been taken away by Allah.³

1 Refer to *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 100 (the biography of 'Alī ibn al-Jahm), *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 20/332 (the biography of Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allah ibn Ja'far a-Ḥimyarī) and 20/262 (the biography of 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn Ibn Bābāwayh).

2 Refer to *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 90

3 *Kashf Ghayāhib al-Jahālāt* pg. 12 of the manuscript.

Al-Ālūsī then goes on to speak about a man from the Rāfiḍāh who claims to have met this imaginary figure whilst he was in hiding. His name is ‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn ibn Mūsā ibn Bābāwayh al-Qummī. He also claims to have received letters from the awaited one. Al-Ālūsī expresses his surprise that a person like this was given the title, al-Ṣadūq (the truthful one) by the Rāfiḍah. He says:

لا يخفى عليك أن هذا من قبيل تسمية الشيء باسم ضده، وهو وإن كان يظهر الإسلام فهو كافر في نفس الأمر

It will be obvious to you that this is a case of naming something using its antonym. Even though he portrayed himself as a Muslim, he was in reality a kāfir.

Next, he explains that the falsity of al-Ṣadūq’s claim cannot be hidden from any intelligent person, as al-Ṣadūq claims that he would write his question on a piece of paper, leave it in a hole in a tree at night, and the Imām would then write the answer.¹ He then explains that the Rāfiḍah did not stop at the point of believing this drivel, rather, they went on to establish that these are their most reliable sources and their strongest proofs. He, just like any other objective intellectual, admits that he cannot understand their claim to be followers of the Ahl al-Bayt, whereas they base the laws of their religion upon all of these forgeries. The lawful and unlawful is established in their religion on the basis of fairy-tales. He says:

إنهم في الحقيقة أتباع الشياطين وأهل البيت بريئون منهم

They are, in reality, the followers of the devils, and the Ahl al-Bayt have nothing to do with them.²

The truth is that these kind of letters hold no weight, whether in courts, on the basis of logic or the intellect of any human. They are notes that are attributed to a child whose existence itself cannot be proven, even according to some sects of

1 Refer to *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 20/262

2 *Kashf Ghayāhib al-Jahālāt* pg. 12 of the manuscript.

the Shī'ah. Hence, some of them rejected his existence. According to researchers, he definitely did not exist. Over and above this, his 'letters' cannot be confirmed and they are transmitted through unknown sources. Can any law be based on something like this, leave alone basing an entire constitution upon it? This is an stain on the Rawāfiḍ, which will remain with them until the end of times. As long as it remains, it will serve as proof of the falsity of their religion. Allah has disgraced those who wish to attribute to His dīn that which has no place in it.

These letters continued throughout the minor occultation—as they refer to it—which lasted for seventy years. Four individuals, who are referred to as *al-Sufarā'* and *al-Nuwwāb* (representatives or deputies) claimed, one after the other to be the Imām's deputies. The fourth one, al-Samarī, announced the end of the era of deputies and communication with the Imām. They say:

خرج التوقيع إلى أبي الحسن السمرّي: (يعني خرجت ورقة من المنتظر المزعوم) يا علي بن محمد السمرّي، اسمع أعظم الله أجر إخوانك فيك، فإنك ميت ما بينك وبين ستة أيام، فأجمع أمرك، ولا توص إلى أحد يقوم مقامك بعد وفاتك، فقد وقعت الغيبة التامة، فلا ظهور إلا بعد إذن الله تعالى ذكره.. وسيأتي من شيعتي من يدعي المشاهدة، ألا فمن ادعى المشاهدة قبل خروج السفيناني والصيحة فهو كذاب مفتر

A letter came out (i.e. a letter came from the awaited one) to Abū al-Ḥasan al-Samarī: O 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Samarī, listen—may Allah grant your brothers a great reward as far as you are concerned—as you are going to die within the next six days. Therefore, gather your matters and do not appoint anyone to take up your post after your death, as the Ghaybah has taken place in its complete form. There will be no appearance, until Allah grants permission. Some from my Shī'ah will appear and claim to have seen (me). Lo! Whoever claims to have seen me before the appearance of the Sufyānī and the Scream (the Day of Qiyāmah) is indeed a lying imposter.¹

This means that the divine texts—according to them—came to an end in the year 329 A.H. with the commencement of *al-Ghaybah al-Kubrā* (Major occultation). However, the Shī' scholars were unhappy with the announcement that contact

1 Ibn Bābāwayh: *Ikmāl al-Dīn* 2/193, al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* pg. 257

has been totally lost with the awaited one. Thus, we find many claims by them of contact with the Imām, meeting him and learning from him (although their Imām said that whoever claims so is a “lying imposter”). Hence, according to them, the divine texts did not come to an end. In fact, the Shī‘ah announced this as soon as al-Samarī died. We find their scholar Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī (who was given the title ‘Allāmah—the one who has extensive knowledge) claiming that he met the Mahdī, who authored a book for him in one night.¹

Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, their celebrated scholar, explains the following text of *al-Kāfi*:

لا بد لصاحب هذا الأمر من غيبة، ولا بد له في غيبته من عزلة، وما بثلاثين من وحشة

It is necessary for the man of this matter to be in occultation and his occultation demands seclusion.

He says:

في كل عصر يوجد ثلاثون مؤمناً ولياً يتشرفون بلقائه

In every era, there are thirty pious believers who have the good-fortune of meeting him.²

They claim further:

إن بعض المجتهدين يتمكن من لقاء الغائب ويأخذ منه بعض الأحكام الشرعية، وقد لا يستطيع أن يعلن عن هذا اللقاء لأمر الإمام له بالكتمان فهو حينئذ يدعي حصول الإجماع على هذا الحكم، وإن لم يوجد إجماع في الحقيقة

Some of the Mujtahids get the ability to meet the absent one and take from him some of the laws of Sharī‘ah. At times, they cannot announce this meeting, due to the instruction of the Imām to keep it hidden, as he will

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 51/361

2 Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī: *Jannat al-Ma’wā* 53/320 (printed with *Bihār al-Anwār*)

then claim that consensus took place upon this law, whereas in reality, no consensus took place.¹

This is one explanation to the claims of their scholars regarding consensus, in those cases where certain opinions were held only by them, yet they claimed that consensus was found. We will also discuss, under the chapter of *ijmāʿ*, their view that if a group of people stated something and among them was ‘an unknown scholar whose lineage was not known’, then *ijmāʿ* takes place, irrespective of who opposes the view, based on the possibility that this unknown person could have been the Imām.

Their scholars firmly believe regarding this awaited one—who did not exist:

كان يجتمع بجملة من أهل العلم والتقوى الذين كانوا يستحقون المقابلة كالعلامة السيد مهدي بحر العلوم النجفي فيما اشتهر عنه، والشيخ ميثم البحراني فيما ينقل عنه

He would get together with some of the people of knowledge and piety, who deserved to be met, such as al-ʿAllāmah al-Sayyī Mahdī Baḥr al-ʿUlūm al-Najafī (according to that which is famous regarding him) and al-Shaykh Maytham al-Baḥrānī (as is narrated regarding him).²

Books have been written by some of their scholars in which the narratives and happenings of the meetings with the awaited one by some people have been recorded. Al-Majlisī (d. 1111 A.H.) done so in *Al-Biḥār* and he was followed al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī (d. 1320 A.H.) who authored a book regarding it, which he named *Jannat al-Maʿwā fīman Fāza bi Liqāʾ al-Ḥujjah wa Muʿjizātuh fī al-Ghaybah al-Kubrā*. In this book, he records fifty-nine stories regarding those who claimed to have met the awaited one, after the era of al-Majlisī.³

In this manner, every accursed devil, from the human and jinn race was given an avenue through which he could plot against these people. He merely had to act

1 *Jannat al-Maʿwā* 53/320-321

2 Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ: *Ḥaṣāʾil al-Fikr* pg. 123

3 Refer to Aghā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī: *Al-Dharīʿah* 5/159

as if he was the awaited one and then he could shove into their religion anything that he wished to, no matter how far it took them away from the truth. As long as this avenue remains, and they regard this to be from the Sunnah, this deviation will not be curbed.

Any irreligious old man, who dons the attire of the dervishes, clads himself in black, portrays himself as a person of knowledge and claims to be from the progeny of ‘Alī عليه السلام—the likes of whom are many—is granted great honour by merely claiming that he met the (non-existent) Imām. He then has the license to change their religion in any way that is demanded by his profanity, especially since these people believe that the Imām adopts different forms and changes his dress-style and appearance.¹

Thus, one of these two explanations apply to all of these meetings; either the one who claims to have met the hidden one is a liar who was either craving for popularity or he wished to misguide people. It is also possible that both of these were his motive. The second explanation is that he was an honest and genuine person, however the person who met him in the guise of the Imām was a devilish imposter.² Ibn Taymiyyah explains:

وكذا منتظر الرافضة قد يراه أحدهم ويكون المرئي جنياً

Similar is the case of the Awaited One of the Rāfiḍah. One of them may (believe that he) saw him whereas he actually saw a jinn.³

This is the exact manner in which the Christians were led astray, as explained by Ibn Taymiyyah, as they believed that after the Messiah was (as they claim)

1 Refer to *Tārīkh al-Ghaybah al-Kubrā* of al-Ṣadr pg. 40

2 For further information regarding the plots of the devil against man, and his adoption of the form of some of their scholars, in order to misguide them further, refer to *al-Furqān bayn Awliyā al-Raḥmān wa Awliyā al-Shayṭān*.

3 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā* 13/95

crucified, he appeared before the *Ḥawārīn* (his companions and helpers), spoke to them, and advised them. This has been mentioned in their Gospels. However, the one who actually appeared before them was a devil who said, “I am the Messiah,” whereas he was not the Messiah.¹

Ibn Taymiyyah goes on to explain, “After al-Ḥallāj was killed, a figure would appear before his followers and say to them, “I am al-Ḥallāj.” They would see with their own eyes his figure. Similarly, there was a person in Egypt who was referred to as al-Dasūqī. After he died, his followers would receive books and leaflets from him. Ibn Taymiyyah says that he saw one of these books that were attributed to al-Dasūqī which were shown to him by one of the sincere followers of al-Dasūqī. He says:

I saw it, in the hand-writing of a jinn, and I have seen the hand-writing of the jinn a few times.

Thereafter, Ibn Taymiyyah listed a few more examples of this nature. He then says:

Similarly, those who believe that ‘Alī or Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah will remain forever, were visited by jinn who adopted their forms. This is something possible and has taken place often. The more ignorant a nation is, the more it occurs amongst them.²

The Narrations of the *Ṣaḥābah*

After seeing that the Twelvers confined themselves to very limited sources, i.e. that which is narrated from some members of the Ahl al-Bayt (who were not

1 It was possible for the *Ḥawārīn* to be confused by this, just as many scholars of the Muslims were confused due to similar occurrences. However, that which al-Masīḥ instructed them to propagate, before being raised was the truth to which they were meant to confine themselves. He was not raised until he conveyed the message of his Rabb, thus there was no need for him to re-appear.

2 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā* 13/94-95

necessarily people of knowledge as will be explained, and they even added the so called letters of a person whose existence cannot be agreed upon), taking these as an equivalent to the words of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, they took one more step in the direction of misguidance by depriving themselves of a great source of knowledge and īmān; i.e. the narrations of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, who were blessed with the great fortune of accompanying Nabī ﷺ, witnessing revelation, and understanding the interpretations. Above all, they were praised by Allah Himself.

Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā (one of their contemporary scholars), whilst explaining the viewpoint of his people regarding the subject says:

إن الشيعة لا يعتبرون من السنة (أعني الأحاديث النبوية) إلا ما صح لهم من طرق أهل البيت... أما ما يرويه مثل أبي هريرة، وسمرة بن جندب، وعمرو بن العاص ونظائرهم فليس لهم عند الإمامية مقدار بعوضة

The Shī'ah pay no attention to the Sunnah (the aḥādīth of Nabī ﷺ), except to those which they consider authentic from the reporters of the Ahl al-Bayt. As for that which is reported by the likes of Abū Hurayrah, Samurah ibn Jundub, 'Amr ibn al-Āṣ etc., they do not even hold the weight of a mosquito's wing according to the Imāmiyyah.¹

Here, he establishes that the stance of the Shī'ah is to accept all narrations which are reported authentically from the Ahl al-Bayt,² leaving out all other narrations,

1 *Aṣl al-Shī'ah wa Uṣūluhā* pg. 79

2 His statement, "except to those which they consider authentic from the reporters of the Ahl al-Bayt," is a deceptive and inaccurate statement. This is because, those who not know the nature of Shī'ism will be misled into thinking that the speech of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, which was reported by the Ahl al-Bayt, is their source of knowledge. The reality, however, is that they consider each of the Twelve 'Imāms' to be like a Rasūl, i.e. he says nothing from his own desires. His speech holds the same weight as the Speech of Allah and His Rasūl. This is why the speech of Rasūlullāh ﷺ rarely appears in their books. They are satisfied with that which is supposedly reported from the Imāms. Likewise, his claim regarding the 'Ahl al-Bayt' is also misleading, as this only refers to a handful of them. According to them, the others do not qualify as narrators. Every member of the Ahl al-Bayt is not an Imām.

¹especially the narrations of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Since they only refer to twelve individuals as the Ahl al-Bayt, and only one of them met Rasūlullāh ﷺ as an adult, i.e. ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, how could it be possible that he alone passed on the entire Sunnah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ to the forthcoming generations?

This cannot be possible, as he was not with Rasūlullāh ﷺ at all times. At times, Rasūlullāh ﷺ would go out on a journey and leave him behind, as in the case of the battle of Tabūk. On other occasions, Rasūlullāh ﷺ would remain in al-Madīnah al-Munawwarah and send him out, as in the case when Nabī ﷺ sent him to Yemen. Another example of this is when Nabī ﷺ sent him along with Abū Bakr to deliver the message to the people of Makkah al-Mukarramah. Added to the above, he could not have been aware of what was happening in the homes of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Thus we find that this was the privilege of the Mothers of the Believers, the noble wives of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Perhaps this was among the reasons and the wisdom behind him ﷺ having a number of wives.

Hence, ‘Alī رضي الله عنه simply could not collect the entire Sunnah. How is it then, that they do not accept anything unless it is reported by him? This concept, of only accepting from the Ahl al-Bayt, also destroys the outstanding attribute of Tawātur as far as the transmission of the Sharīah of the Qur’ān and the Sunnah of Nabī ﷺ is concerned. This is why the Muslims have agreed that the knowledge should not be transmitted by only one person, but rather, a group of people (who could be considered enough to reach the amount of Tawātur) should transmit it,

continued from page 467

1 Thus, a narration from the progeny of Fāṭimāh رضي الله عنها, from the children of Ḥasan رضي الله عنه would not be accepted by them, as none of his offspring or descendants were Imāms. The most that they could qualify for, is to be narrators who will be graded by the Shī’ah, either as acceptable narrators or rejected narrators. It is for this reason that the Twelvers regarded as kāfir any member of the Ahl al-Bayt who stood up for the post of Khilāfah besides the Twelve Imāms. Refer to *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/372. A prime example could be al-Ṭūsī’s rejection of the narrations of Zayd ibn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه in *Al-Istibṣār* (1/66). Thus, the statement of Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā is undoubtedly misleading. The reason behind his deception is that this book was spread in the Islamic countries to call towards Shī’ism.

so that the one who was not present may have certainty regarding it.¹ Most of the Islamic states received their knowledge from sources besides ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.²

Most of those who conveyed the message of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم were not from the Ahl al-Bayt. It is thus unfathomable that ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was the only person to do so. Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم sent As‘ad ibn Zurārah to his people (the people of al-Madīnah) to invite them towards Islam, teach the Anṣār the Qur’ān and convey to them the understanding of dīn. Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم sent Alā ibn al-Ḥaḍramī رضي الله عنه to Bahrain, Mu‘adh and Abū Mūsā رضي الله عنه to Yemen, and ‘Itāb ibn Usayd رضي الله عنه to Makkah al-Mukarramah; all with the same purpose. In light of this, what weight does the statement of the one who says that only a man from the Ahl al-Bayt conveyed his message?³

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/138, Ibn Taymiyyah goes on to say, “The narration of one person is not sufficient for knowledge of the Qur’ān and the mutawātir Sunnah. If they say, ‘It is attained due to the transmission of the one who is infallible,’ it will be said to them, ‘It is necessary to first prove that he is infallible, which cannot be proven from his own statements as it is not yet established that he is infallible. It cannot be established by Ijmā’ as well since no Ijmā’ took place regarding it. According to the Imāmiyyah, Ijmā’ is only a proof on the basis of the belief that the Imām is among them. Thus, the matter once again depends upon proving that he is infallible, which cannot be backed by anything besides his own supposed statements. If he was infallible, as they claim, there would have been other proofs to it as well.” *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/139

2 Ibn Taymiyyah says, “The cities of Islam received knowledge regarding Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم from people other than ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. As for the people of al-Madīnah and Makkah, the matter is clear. Similar is the case of the people of Shām and Baṣrah. These people hardly narrate from ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. Most of his knowledge was preserved in Kūfah. However, its inhabitants had learnt the Qur’ān and Sunnah even before the Khilāfah of ‘Uthmān, leave alone the Khilāfah of ‘Alī. The jurists of al-Madīnah had mastered the dīn during the reign of ‘Umar رضي الله عنه. As for Yemen, Mu‘adh رضي الله عنه stayed among them and taught them for a lengthier period than ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. Hence the people of Yemen narrate more narrations from Mu‘adh رضي الله عنه as compared to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. Shurayḥ and the other senior Tābi‘īn became accomplished jurists under the tutelage of Mu‘adh ibn Jabal رضي الله عنه. When ‘Alī رضي الله عنه arrived at Kūfah, Shurayḥ was already a judge. He and Ubaydah al-Salmānī had become jurists under the guidance of others. In a nutshell, the knowledge of Islam had spread before ‘Alī رضي الله عنه arrived at Kūfah.” *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/15

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/15

Some of the scholars have said that the total number of aḥādīth that are reported with complete chains from ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ are five hundred and eighty six, from which a mere fifty are authentic.¹ Is the Sunnah of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ confined to this? The Shī‘ah admit the knowledge of ḥalāl and ḥarām and the rites of Ḥajj did not reach them except through Abū Ja‘far. This means that nothing reached them on this subject from ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and hence their predecessors would adhere to that which was reported to them by the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

The books of the Shī‘ah state:

كانت الشيعة قبل أن يكون أبو جعفر وهم لا يعرفون مناسك حجهم وحلالهم وحرامهم، حتى كان أبو جعفر ففتح لهم وبين لهم مناسك حجهم وحلالهم وحرامهم، حتى صار الناس يحتاجون إليهم من بعد ما كانوا يحتاجون إلى الناس

Prior to Abū Ja‘far, the Shī‘ah were unaware of the rites of their Ḥajj as well as their ḥalāl and ḥarām. When Abu Ja‘far appeared, he explained to them the rites of their Ḥajj and their ḥalāl and ḥarām so much so that people became in need of them after they were in need of the people.²

It is indeed amazing that the Shī‘ah declare as mushrik the one who lends an ear to anyone besides the Imām. *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* states:

من ادعى سماعاً من غير الباب الذي فتحه الله فهو مشرك

Whoever claims to have heard anything from anywhere, besides the door that was opened by Allah is a mushrik.³

There you have it! They have just declared that their predecessors were mushrik, as they took their knowledge of Ḥajj and ḥalāl and ḥarām from the masses. They also say:

1 Ibn Ḥazm: *al-Faṣl* 4/213, *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/139

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/20, *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 1/252-253, *al-Burhān* 1/386, *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 425

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/377

Anything that does not emanate from the Imāms is false.¹

This is a brazen attack against the Sharīah of the master of all the messengers, which was transmitted by the first generation to the rest of the ummah. This knowledge is referred to as the sublime Sunnah and it is upheld by the Muslims. The Rāfiḍah, after concocting their principle, that knowledge can only be taken from ‘Alī عليه السلام, and thereafter realising that the narrations from him are very minimal (to the extent that they even admitted not having anything on the subjects of Ḥajj and ḥalāl and ḥarām from him), perhaps resorted to their usual practise of fabricating narrations, in order to fill this void. It is for this reason that al-Sha‘bī said:

Fabrications have not been forged against any person of this Ummah as much as they have been forged against ‘Alī عليه السلام.²

Due to the widespread forgeries against ‘Alī عليه السلام by the Rāfiḍah³ — to the extent that not a single person from them could be relied upon for narrations — the authors of the authentic books were forced to turn away from them. Therefore, it can be seen that al-Bukhārī and Muslim do not narrate anything from him unless it is reported by his household, such as his children Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyah, his scribe — ‘Ubayd Allah ibn Abī Rāfi‘, the companions of Ibn Mas‘ūd and others such as ‘Ubaydah al-Salmānī, al-Ḥārith al-Taymī, Qays ibn ‘Ubād and others. These few individuals could be trusted as they were honest in that which they narrated from ‘Alī عليه السلام.⁴

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/399

2 *Al-Dhababī: Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā* 4/307

3 Ibn al-Jawzī said, ‘The Rāfiḍah are of three types; one group who heard a ḥadīth and then fabricated other aḥādīth adding on and deleting, a second group who heard nothing, but you see them attributing their lies to Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq saying, “Ja‘far said” and “So and so said”, and a third group who are the ignorant commoners, they utter anything that comes to their mind, whether it makes sense or not.’ Ibn al-Jawzī: *al-Mawḍū‘āt* 1/338, Ibn Taymiyyah: *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/119

4 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā* 13/32

The books of the Shī'ah have admitted that there are many fabrications against the Ahl al-Bayt. Ja'far al-Ṣādiq is reported to have said, as stated in the books of the Shī'ah:

إن الناس أولعوا بالكذب علينا

People are fascinated with fabricating against us.¹

The dilemma faced by Ja'far was:

اكتنفه - كما تقول كتب الشيعة - قوم جهال يدخلون عليه ويخرجون من عنده ويقولون: حدثنا جعفر بن محمد، ويحدثون بأحاديث كلها منكرات كذب موضوعة على جعفر ليستأكلوا الناس بذلك ويأخذوا منهم الدراهم

A bunch of ignorant people surrounded him, they would enter his presence and leave from his gatherings saying, "Ja'far ibn Muḥammad narrated to us...", and thereafter they would narrate such things that were lies and drivel, which were fabricated in the name of Ja'far so that they could collect food and dirhams from the people by means of it.²

Some of the scholars have said:

The amount of forgeries that were attributed to Ja'far, despite his innocence outnumber the forgeries against others.³

From the above, we can gauge the depth of the problems of the Shī'ah, who accept the narrations of all these liars and fraudsters but reject the narrations of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. In fact, they shamelessly declare the bunch of liars who thronged around Ja'far to be reliable narrators. They say:

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 2/246

2 Refer to *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 208-209, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/302-303 (this is only a portion of the text, which will appear in its entirety later).

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/143

روى عن الإمام الصادق أربعة آلاف راو. وذهب بعض علماء الإمامية إلى القول بتوثيق الأربعة آلاف بدون استثناء

Four thousand narrators have reported from Ja'far. Some of the scholars of the Imāmiyyah are inclined towards the opinion of considering all of them, without any exception, to be reliable.¹

This is despite him personally complaining about them. He was also reported to have said that from all of those who claim Shī'ism, he could not even get seventeen genuine supporters. This is emphatically stated in a narration of *al-Kāfi*.² The question that still remains is, why do the Twelvers disregard the aḥādīth of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ?

The actual cause can be traced back to the initial innovation, which was started off by 'Abd Allāh ibn Saba', i.e. 'Alī was appointed as the successor by Rasūlullāh ﷺ, but the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ did not allow the bequest of Nabī ﷺ to take place and they denied him the post of Khilāfah. This, according to the Shī'ah, meant that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ all left the fold of Islam. They do not exclude anybody from them, except a few who could be counted on the fingers of one hand, as will appear. This sect did not give any consideration to the praises of Allah and His Rasūl regarding them, their companionship of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, their Jihād and sacrifices in the path of Allah, the fact that they were the first of the ummah to respond to the call of Nabī ﷺ and the fact that they put forward their lives and most valuable possessions and left behind their homelands and families to the spread Islam.

Among the most ironic beliefs held by the Shī'ah is that they consider anyone who claims to have seen the non-existent Imām as a reliable and truthful person. Al-Mamaqānī (who is one of their contemporary scholars) says:

1 Muhammad Jawād Mughniyah: *al-Shī'ah fi al-Mizān* pg. 110, Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Muẓaffar: *al-Imām al-Ṣādiq* pg. 144, Aghā Buzurg: *Al-Dharī'ah* 2.129, *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 2/72

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 2/242-243

تشرف الرجل برؤية الحجة - عجل الله فرجه وجعلنا من كل مكروه فداه - بعد غيبته فنستشهد بذلك على كونه في مرتبة أعلى من مرتبة العدالة ضرورة

If a man had the fortune of seeing the *Hujjah* (Imām) — may Allah hasten his release and may he allow us to be sacrificed in lieu of any difficulty (that he is to face) — after his occultation, we prove by means of that that he has obviously reached the highest level of integrity.¹

However, the same honour is not afforded to those who were blessed with the companionship of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. They do not consider the honour accrued by the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, by means of seeing Nabī ﷺ to be a reason on the basis of which they could be considered as men of integrity. Does Rasūlullāh ﷺ not hold a loftier rank than an awaited individual whose existence was debated by the Shī'ah of his era? What would his position be today, after the passing of so many centuries? Is this not an outright contradiction?

Observe and be amazed at how a person is declared reliable due to claiming that he met one who does not exist, which in reality is a clear proof that he is a liar. On the other hand, the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ are maligned. The only 'sin' of all the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ was that they did not accept the "immediate appointment" of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to the post of Khilāfah. This, according to them, is among the worst possible crimes, as the one who rejects the Imāmah of any of the Twelve Imāms — even the absent one who does not exist — is like Iblīs, as stated by al-Ṣadūq Ibn Bābāwayh al-Qummī.²

Believing in their Imāms is the yardstick by means of which they judge whether a person should be accepted or rejected. This, according to them is the foundation of īmān, as will be explained. This is clear deviation. If this belief of theirs was half as important as they assert, it would have definitely been mentioned by Allah in the Qur'ān, Rasūlullāh ﷺ would have explained it to all those who enquired

1 *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* 1/211

2 *Ikmal al-Dīn* pg. 13

regarding the reality of īmān and the Muslims would have had no difference of opinion regarding it.

Can any intelligent person fathom that from the era of the Ṣaḥābah and Ṭābiʿīn, up until today, the ummah did not know the most basic and fundamental aspect of their dīn or they unanimously rejected it? It is impossible that Allah and His Rasūl would leave the best ummah, who were selected for the guidance of humanity without completing for them their dīn and without explaining to them a fundamental from the fundamentals of Islam. Foolishness like this can never cross the mind of a Believer.

My observation: Despite the falsity of this doctrine of theirs, by means of which they judge people and reject the narrations of those who reject any of the Imāms, they only apply it to the Ṣaḥābah عليه السلام. Thus, they reject the narrations of the Ṣaḥābah عليه السلام, but they do not reject the narrations of some of their Shīʿī predecessors who rejected one or more of the Imāms. Their scholar, al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī insists that the Imāmiyyah accept and practise upon the narrations of the Faṭḥiyyah¹, such as ʿAbd Allāh ibn Bukayr, as well as the narrations of the Wāqifah², such as Samāʿah ibn Mahrān. You will see, in their books on narrators, that many of them were Faṭḥīs, Wāqifīs or Nāwūsīs.³

1 Refer to page 124 of this book.

2 They stop at Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar. They do not believe in the Imāmah of anyone after him. This is because they believed that Mūsā was alive and he did not pass away. They await his return, just as the Twelvers await the appearance of their imaginary hidden one. Refer to al-Qummī: *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* pg. 93, al-Nāshī al-Akbar: *Masāʾil al-Imāmah* pg. 47. The author of *al-Zīnah* says, “Some hold this opinion up until this day.” *Al-Zīnah* pg. 290. However, they then ceased to exist.

The term Wāqifiyyah is used at times to refer to those groups who believed that Imāmah ended with others as well, such as those who believe that it was terminated after ʿAlī, al-Ṣādiq, or Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī.

3 The followers of a man named Nāwūs, Ibn al-Nāwūs or ʿAjlān ibn al-Nāwūs. It is also said that this was actually an attribution to the village of Nāwūs. This sect believed that Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad did not pass away, he is alive and he will not pass away until he emerges and rules. He is the Mahdī. The author of *al-Zīnah* says, “This sect no longer exists. None can be found today who uphold this view.” However, their narrations have remained in the books of the Twelvers.

Refer to al-Qummī: *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* pg. 80, al-Nawbakhtī: *Firaq al-Shīʿah* pg. 67, al-Rāzī: *al-Zīnah* pg. 286, al-Ashʿarī: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/100, al-Shahrastānī 1/166-167, Nishwān: *al-Ḥūr al-ʿĪn* pg. 162.

Each one of these three groups reject at least one of the Imāms of the Twelvers. Despite this, all of them are considered to be from them and reliable. As an example, *Rijāl al-Kashshī* states regarding Muḥammad ibn al-Walīd al-Khazzār, Mu‘āwiyah ibn Ḥakīm, Muṣaddaq ibn Ṣadaqah, Muḥammad ibn Sālim ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd:

في محمد بن الوليد الخزار، ومعاوية بن حكيم، ومصدق بن صدقة، ومحمد بن سالم بن عبد الحميد قال أبو عمرو (الكشي): وهؤلاء كلهم فطحية وهم من أجلة العلماء والفقهاء والعدول، وبعضهم أدرك الرضا - رضي الله عنه - وكلهم كوفيون

All of these are Faṭḥiyyah and they are from the greatest scholars, jurists and people of integrity. Some of them met al-Riḍā عليه السلام, and all of them were Kūfīs.¹

Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Fuḍāl,² ‘Alī ibn Ḥadīd ibn Ḥakīm,³ and ‘Amr ibn Sa‘īd al-Madāyini⁴ were all from the Faṭḥiyyah. Similarly, Abū Khālīd al-Sijistānī,⁵ ‘Alī ibn Ja‘far al-Marwazī,⁶ ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Īsā,⁷ and Ḥamzah ibn Bazīgh⁸ were all from the Wāqifah. Notwithstanding this, they were classified as reliable and the Twelvers practised upon their narrations, ignoring the statements of their Imām:

الزيدية والواقفة والنصاب بمنزلة واحدة

The Zaydiyyah, Wāqifah, and Nawāṣib are all on the same level.⁹

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 563

2 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 565

3 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 570

4 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 612

5 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 612

6 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 616

7 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 597

8 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 615

9 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 456

and

والواقف عائد عن الحق ومقيم على سيئة إن مات بها كانت جهنم مأواه وبش المصير

The Wāqif is turned away from the truth and he stands upon an evil. If he dies in this state, hell will be his abode and it is the most undesired destination.¹

He also said:

الواقفة ”يعيشون حيارى ويموتون زنادقة

The Wāqifah live in a state of confusion and they die as heretics.²

Yet another statement of his reads:

فإنهم كفار مشركون زنادقة

They are disbelievers, polytheists and heretics.³

Despite all of this, their narrations are accepted, or rather, the scholars of the Twelvers accept the narrations of these people, since some of the bizarre views of their religion are based on these narrations. At the same time, they reject the narrations of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. Is this not a clear contradiction? The Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم only “rejected the text regarding one Imām,” but their narrations are rejected, whereas these narrators from the Waqifah and Faṭḥiyyah reject a few Imāms, as well as the texts that were stated by the Imāms prior to the rejected ones. Are all not guilty of the same ‘crime’ (rejection of any of the Imāms) on the basis of which the narrations of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم were rejected?

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 456

2 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 456

3 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 456

After realising this, it will become abundantly clear to us that they have major contradictions in their religion, they do not have a fixed set of rules and their scholars were blinded by sectarianism. They then led astray their followers and deprived them of the fountains of knowledge and īmān. Before we conclude this discussion, it should be noted that it is impossible to compare those luminaries who were praised by Allah and His Rasūl to a bunch of scums, liars, and fraudsters. Had it not been for the need of highlighting the baseless nature of their attitude towards the narrations of the illustrious Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, we would not have mentioned them together.

The books of the Shī'ah state:

عن ابن حازم قال: قلت لأبي عبد الله.. فأخبرني عن أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم صدقوا على محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم أم كذبوا؟ قال: بل صدقوا

I (Ibn Ḥāzim) said to Abū ‘Abd Allāh, “Tell me about the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, were they truthful or did they forge lies against him?”

He replied, “No, they were truthful.”¹

No doubt, the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ have no need for this type of praise, after they were praised by Allah and His Rasūl. However, we quoted it to bring to the attention of the reader that they opposed everything, even that which is reported from the Imāms in their very own books, which conforms to the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Rasūl رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. Instead they chose to follow the narrations of a bunch of people who fabricated lies against the Imāms, such people whose lies have been exposed in the books of the Shī'ah as well, as will be proven.²

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/65, Biḥār al-Anwār 2/228

2 Under the discussion of the condition of their narrators, who narrate from the Imāms.

The Beginning of the Compilation of Aḥādīth by the Shī'ah

Ibn al-Nadīm says:

إن أول كتاب ظهر للشيعة كتاب سليم بن قيس الهلالي “رواه عن أبان بن أبي عياش لم يروه غيره

The first book of the Shī'ah that became apparent was the book of *Sulaym ibn Qays al-Hilālī*.¹ He narrated it from Abān ibn Abī 'Ayyāsh, no other person narrated it.²

We touched upon this book during our discussion on the tale of 'fabrication' according to the Shī'ah. One of the latter day Shī'ī personalities has the following admission to make:

بأن هذا الكتاب موضوع في آخر الدولة الأموية

This book was compiled towards the end of the Umayyad dynasty.

In other words, there is no truth to its attribution to Sulaym. We have already explained that this Sulaym is not mentioned anywhere in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, even though the Shī'ah hold him in very high regard. Some believe that he did not exist. If he did exist, he would have been mentioned somewhere. Apparently, the largest compilation of theirs, in the early days, is that which was compiled by Abū Ja'far al-Qummī (Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn Farrūkh al-Ṣaffār al-Qummī, d. 290 A.H.). He named his compilation *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt fī 'Ulūm Āl Muḥammad wa mā Khaṣṣahum Allāh bihī*. This book was printed in the year 1285 A.H.³ Al-Ṣaffār was considered by Brokلمان as the founder of Imāmī jurisprudence in the non-Arab countries.⁴

1 *Al-Fahrist* pg. 219

2 *Al-Fahrist* pg. 219, *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 4/67, *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 83, *Jāmi' al-Ruwāt* 1/374, al-Barūjardī: *al-Burhān* pg. 104

3 Refer to *Al-Dharī'ah* 3/124

4 *Tārīkh al-Adab al-'Arabī* 3/337

Dr Muḥammad al-Baltājī is of the view that he was the first person who compiled the jurisprudence and narrations of the Imāmiyyah Twelvers.¹ However, the statement of Ibn al-Nadīm proves that he was not the first person to do so. Al-Majlisī quoted most of this book in the different chapters of his encyclopaedia *Al-Biḥār*. Nonetheless, this book is filled with extremism. In it, one will find criticism of the Qur’ān, fanaticism regarding the A’immah, and verdicts of kufr regarding the Ṣaḥābah; all of which confirm that majority of these narrations have been fabricated in the names of the Imāms.

Al-Kulaynī (d. 328 or 329 A.H.) authored his book, *al-Kāfī*, in the beginning of the fourth century, after which many other books were authored.

The Primary Books of the Twelvers

The primary books, which are considered the sources of narrations by the Twelvers are eight in number. They are referred to as ‘al-Jawāmi‘ al-Thamāniyah’.² The Shī‘ah believe that these are the most important sources of the narrations of the Imāms.³ Their contemporary scholar, Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-Ḥā’irī says:

وأما صحاح الإمامية فهي ثمانية، أربعة منها للمحمدين الثلاثة الأوائل، وثلاثة بعدها للمحمدين الثلاثة
الأواخر، وثامنهما لحسين – المعاصر – النوري

The authentic books of the Shī‘ah are eight. Four of them were compiled by the first three Muḥammads, three of them were compiled by the last three Muḥammads and the eighth one was compiled by Ḥusayn al-Nūrī, a contemporary.⁴

1 *Manāḥij al-Tashrī‘ al-Islāmī* 1/201

2 *Miftāḥ al-Kutub al-Arba‘ah* 1/5

3 *A‘yān al-Shī‘ah* 1/288, *Miftāḥ al-Kutub al-Arba‘ah* 1/5

4 Al-Ḥā’irī: *Minhāj ‘Amlī lī al-Taqrīb* (An article that was published in the magazine, *Risālat al-Islām* (in Cairo). It was also published with a few other selected articles in a magazine called *al-Waḥdat al-Islāmiyyah* pg. 233)

1. The first and most authentic of these, according to them is, *al-Kāfi*,¹ by Muḥammad ibn Ya'qūb al-Kulaynī.
2. *Man lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh*² by the one who is referred to as al-Ṣadūq, Muḥammad Ibn Bābāwayh al-Qummī (d. 381 A.H.) is their second book,
3. *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*³ and *Al-Istibṣār*⁴ by Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Tūsī – who they refer gave the title Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifāh - (d. 360 A.H.) are the third and fourth of their books.

1 For more details regarding *al-Kāfi*, refer to *Al-Dharī'ah* 17/145, al-Nūrī: *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* 3/432, *Muqaddimat al-Kāfi*, al-Ḥurr al-Āmilī: *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 20/71. These references point out that *al-Kāfi* is the most authentic of the four authentic books according to them, and it was compiled during *al-Ghaybah* al-Ṣuḡhrā, due to which all of the texts therein were verified. It is the only book, from their four authentic books, wherein the Book of Allah is criticised. The total number of narrations of *al-Kāfi*, as stated by al-Āmilī is 16099. *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1/280.

This book has been printed a few times, and a number of their scholars wrote commentaries on it. One of the commentaries which I have seen is *Mir'āt al-'Uqūl*, by al-Majlisī. He attempted to grade their narrations from the perspective of authenticity. Sadly, he authenticated such narrations which are, according to all Muslims, clear-cut kufr, such as the narrations regarding Taḥrīf in the Qur'ān. I also saw the commentary of al-Māzindarānī titled *Sharḥ al-Jāmi'* as well as *al-Shāfi Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfi*.

2 For more details on this subject refer to al-Khūwansārī: *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 6/230-237, *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1.280, *Muqaddimat Man lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh*. The book contains 176 chapters, the first one being the chapter of *Ṭahārah* (purity) and the last one being *al-Nawādir* (rare subjects). There is a total of 9044 narrations. In the introduction of his book, he mentions that he omitted the isnāds so that the narrations do not become excessive, and he took his narrations from their famous books, thus it should be relied upon. He also mentions that he did not narrate except that which he considered authentic.

3 Refer to al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī: *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* 4/719, *Al-Dharī'ah* 4/504 and *Muqaddimat Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*. This book was authored to reconcile the contradictions and differences that are found in their narrations. It has a total of 393 chapters. The total number of narrations will be discussed later.

4 This book is made up of three volumes. Two of them pertain to *'Ibādāt* (worship) whilst the third volume covers the rest of the chapters of Fiqh. It also has 393 chapters, and the total number of narrations, according to the author, is 5511. He says, "I have restricted them so that additions and deletions may not take place." In *Al-Dharī'ah*, it is stated that the total number of narrations of this book is 6531. However this contradicts the statement of the author.

Refer to *Al-Dharī'ah* 2/14, *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1/280 and Ḥasan al-Kharsāns forward to *Al-Istibṣār*.

Their scholar, al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī (d. 1091 A.H) says:

إن مدار الأحكام الشرعية اليوم على هذه الأصول الأربعة، وهي المشهود عليها بالصحة من مؤلفيها

Today, the laws of the Sharī'ah are based on these four primary books. Their authenticity has been testified to by their authors.¹

Aghā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī, one of their contemporary Mujtahids says:

الكتب الأربعة والمجاميع الحديثية التي عليها استنباط الأحكام الشرعية حتى اليوم

The laws of Sharī'ah are deduced from the four books and the ḥadīth compilations, until today.²

These are their four classical sources. Thereafter, Shī'ī scholars of the eleventh century and those who followed wrote a number of books. Four of these books are accepted by the contemporary Shī'ah and they have been named "the four compilations of the latter times". They are:

1. *Al-Wāfi*³, by Muḥammad ibn Murtaḍā (also known as Mullā Muḥsin al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī, d. 1091 A.H.),
2. *Biḥār al-Anwār al-Jāmi'ah lī Durar Akhbār al-A'immaḥ al-Aṭḥār*⁴ by Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī (d. 1110 or 1111 A.H.),

1 *Al-Wāfi* 1/11

2 *Al-Dharī'ah* 2/14

3 This book is made up of three large volumes and it was printed in Iran. It has 273 chapters. Muḥammad Baḥr al-'ulūm, one of their contemporary scholars, says that it has five thousand narrations. *Lu'lu'at al-Baḥrain*, footnote on page 122. However, Muḥsin al-Amīn states that the total number of narrations is 44244. *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1/280

4 They have stated that this is the most comprehensive book on narrations. The author gathered them from their reliable books. Refer to *Al-Dharī'ah* 3/27, *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1/293

3. *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah*¹ ilā *Taḥṣīl Masā'il al-Sharī'ah* by Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī (d. 1104 A.H.)
4. *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il*² by Ḥusayn al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī (d. 1320 A.H.).

A Few Observations Regarding the Eight Books

There are many books of theirs, which they consider to be of the same level as the four books, as far as relying upon them and using them as proofs is concerned. This is stated by al-Majlisī in the forward of his *Biḥār*³ and al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī in *al-*

1 This, according to them, is the most comprehensive book on the narrations pertaining to laws. The author gathered the narrations of their Imāms from their four books, which have been their primary sources along the centuries. He also added on narrations, which he took from the reliable books (which in this case are 70) of their scholars, as stated by the author of *Al-Dharī'ah*. Al-Shīrāzī, on the other hand, mentioned in the forward of *al-Wasā'il* that they are more than 180 in number. The two numbers are nowhere close to one-another. Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī listed the books from which the author quoted. According to my count, they were 80 books. He then indicated that many other books were also referred to, but they were quoted from through the medium of other books.

It was printed in three volumes on a number of occasions, but the final print, which was printed with authentications and footnotes by a team of their scholars comprised of twenty volumes.

Al-Shīrāzī: *Muqaddimat al-Wasā'il*, *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1/292-293, *Al-Dharī'ah* 4/352, 353, al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 1/4-8, 20/36-49

2 Aghā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī says, "The book *al-Mustadrak* is like any of the other compilations of narrations of the latter times, in the sense that it is necessary upon the well-versed mujtahids to refer to it when deducing laws. Most of our contemporary scholars have adhered to this." *Al-Dharī'ah* 2/110-111. Thereafter, he proved this, using some of the statements of the contemporary scholars in which they state that *al-Mustadrak* is among their primary sources. *Al-Dharī'ah* 2/110-111.

However, it seems as if all of their scholars do not agree with him. We find that the author of *Aḥsan al-Wadī'ah* criticises this book in the strongest of words. He says, 'Books which are unreliable and unacceptable are quoted from... and books, the copies of which could not be established as authentic, as there were great differences between the different copies.' Thereafter, he says that its narrations are confined to that which is in *Al-Biḥār*. "They have been spread out in the relevant chapters of *al-Wasā'il*, as compared by me, word for word." Muḥammad Mahdī al-Kāẓimī: *Aḥsan al-Wadī'ah* pg. 74

3 Refer to vol. 1 pg. 26, al-Majlisī says that the books of al-Ṣadūq, with the exception of five of them, are just as famous as the four books. (ibid). He says, "The book, *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* is from the reliable sources, from which al-Kulaynī and others have quoted. (vol.1 pg. 27)" He has similar comments regarding many of their books.

Wasā'il.¹ This can also be found in the forwards of those books. It seems as if the four books were only singled out on account of them being large collections, or as an attempt to imitate the Ahl al-Sunnah.

The second possibility is strengthened by the fact that they have regarded *Al-Wāfi* as a separate book among their eight fundamental books, whereas it is a mere compilation of all the narrations of the four initial books, i.e. *al-Kāfi*, *Al-Tahdhīb*, *Al-Istibṣār* and *Man lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh*. How can a book like this be considered a separate book, when it is a compilation of the other books? Similarly, they counted *Al-Istibṣār* of al-Ṭūsī as a separate source, whereas it is nothing more than a summary of the *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* of al-Ṭūsī, as stated by al-Ṭūsī in the forward of *Al-Istibṣār*.² This is also quite clear to the one who compares the two books. These acts clearly point towards the possibility that they were creating a name for their religion.

Added to that, the original version of *Biḥār al-Anwār* was divided by the author into twenty-five volumes. However, after seeing that the twenty-fifth volume became too large, he divided it into two, bringing the total number of volumes to twenty-six.³ However, the contemporary Shī'ah have added on a few books which were not part of the authors book such as *Jannat al-Ma'wā* of al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, *Hidāyat al-Akhbār* by al-Mustarḥamī and a few more volumes containing permissions (to transmit knowledge or narrations), so that the total number of volumes could be one hundred and ten! It does not end there, the first volume is numbered 'zero'. If this is not an attempt to show off their 'heritage' then what else can it be? In fact, they are obsessed with the idea of showing off the 'accolades' of their religion.⁴

1 Refer to *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* vol. 20

2 *Al-Istibṣār* 1/2-3

3 Refer to *Al-Dharī'ah* 3/27

4 This is why you will find that a large group from them will get together to write on any random subject, and the *ḥawzahs* (their study circles) will be dedicated to it. Thereafter, once the book is complete, it will be attributed to one of them or one of their scholars, as if he was the only one who carried out this task, which could not have been done except by a group of people. This can be realised from books such as *Kitāb al-Ghadīr*. They are also infatuated with claiming to be the first to do everything.

As for the subject-matters of these books; *Al-Tahdhīb*, *Al-Istibṣār*, *Man lā Yaḥdurhū al-Faqīh*, *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* and *Mustadrak* are all regarding *Fiqh* (jurisprudence). As for *al-Kāfī*, the first two volumes are regarding matters of belief, whilst the rest of the volumes are regarding *Fiqh*, thus they are referred to as *Furū' al-Kāfī*. Many of their verdicts are very similar to those of the Ahl al-Sunnah, which strengthens the view of those scholars who believe that they merely copied them from the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah.¹

They also have a few of their own rulings, which are nothing less than bizarre, and a few more which are totally unimaginable. These deserve to be written in a separate book. Their scholar, al-Murtaḍā gathered a few of them in a book which he named *Al-Intiṣār*.² Ibn 'Aqīl al-Hanbalī quoted some of these rulings, after which he expressed great surprise. Ibn al-Jawzī recorded them in *al-Muntaẓam*³ from that which was in the handwriting of Ibn 'Aqīl. He indicated towards this in *al-Mawḍū'āt* saying:

ولقد وضعت الرافضة كتاباً في الفقه وسموه مذهب الإمامية، وذكروا فيه ما يخرق إجماع المسلمين بلا دليل أصلاً

continued from page 484

This is why you will always find them claiming to be the first people to discover and master Islamic sciences, even though the Rawāfiḍ are usually clueless until they learn from the Ahl al-Sunnah. They have a few dictionaries, which expose their ignorance.

Al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī, in his book *A'yān al-Shī'ah*, counts many of the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah among the Shī'ah, simply because it had been mentioned in their biographies that they were inclined towards Shī'ism (which in these cases implied a stronger affinity with 'Alī عليه السلام and the Ahl al-Bayt), despite the fact that this, in no way, entered them into the religion of the Rawāfiḍ. The reality is that true and genuine love for the Ahl al-Bayt is found to a much greater extent among the Ahl al-Sunnah as compared to the Rāfiḍāh.

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawīyah* 3/246

2 I have seen the latest print, by Dār al-Aḍwā of Beirut (1405). It was printed prior to that in *al-Jawāmi' al-Fiqhiyyah* in Tehran in the year 1267 A.H, and separately in the year 1315 A.H. Another name of this book is *Masā'il al-Infirādāt fī al-Fiqh*. Refer to *Lu'lu'at al-Baḥrain* pg. 320

3 *Al-Muntaẓam* 8/120

The Rāfiḍah have written a book on jurisprudence which they named *Madh-hab al-Imāmiyyah*. In it, they have mentioned that which is against the consensus of all Muslims, without any proof.¹

As for the remainder of these compilations, viz. *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* and *Biḥār al-Anwār* – they are concerning a few matters such as Tawḥīd, al-‘Adl (justice), Imāmah and so on. Majority of these books are made up of their beliefs and views regarding Imāmah, the Twelve Imāms, the idea that they were divinely appointed, their qualities, their conditions, visiting their graves and their enemies, the foremost of them being the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. One will also notice that most matters revolve around Imāmah and the Imāms.

The one who reads these books will also notice the vast and apparent differences between the narrations which are taken from the Ahl al-Sunnah, referred to as ‘ḥadīth’ by them and the narrations of the Shī‘ah which they refer to as ‘riwāyāt’. If a ḥadīth is reported in the ḥadīth compilations of the Ahl al-Sunnah, it will be attributed to Nabī ﷺ, and it will really be his ḥadīth. As for the books of the Shī‘ah, they narrate from any of the Twelve Imāms and they believe, as stated previously – that there is no difference between the ‘statements’ of the Imāms and the aḥādīth of Nabī ﷺ.

The reader will also notice that very few of their narrations are attributed to Nabī ﷺ. Most of the narrations of *al-Kāfi* are reported from Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq, and a few of them are reported from his father, Muḥammad al-Bāqir. An even lesser amount is recorded from Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and those that go all the way up until Nabī ﷺ are just an odd few. Another noteworthy fact is that the four latter compilations were compiled in the eleventh century and later. The last of them was compiled in the year 1320 A.H. by al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, a contemporary of Muḥammad ‘Abduh. In it, he gathered twenty-three thousand narrations from the Imāms², **which were unknown prior to his compilation.**

1 *Al-Mawḍū‘āt* 1/338

2 *Al-Dharī‘ah* 7/21

Thus, these narrations appeared hundreds of years after the Imāms. If the Shī'ah preserved those narrations by means of an isnād (i.e. passing it on generation after generation) and by narrating them, then how can an intelligent person rely upon a narration that was not written down for a period of eleven or thirteen centuries? If they were written and recorded in books, then how is it that these books were not discovered except in the later eras?¹

Why is it that these narrations were not recorded by their predecessors? Why are they not found in their books? Why did al-Kulaynī not record them, whereas he had access to the four deputies of the Mahdī (who named the book *al-Kāfi*, after

1 Some of authors of these compilations have explicitly mentioned that they came across books that were not previously part of their authentic books. Al-Majlisī says,

اجتمع عندنا بحمد الله سوى الكتب الأربعة نحو مائتي كتاب، ولقد جمعتهما في بحار الأنوار

By the grace of Allah, besides the four books, we have in our possession approximately two hundred books. I have gathered them in *Biḥār al-Anwār*. (*Al-I'tiqādāt* of al-Majlisī pg. 24, Muṣṭafā al-Shībī: *al-Fikr al-Shī'ī* pg. 61)

Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī mentioned that he had more than eighty books, besides the four fundamental books, and he gathered them in *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* (Refer to the introduction of *al-Wasā'il* and *Al-Dharī'ah* 4/352-353).

Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, despite being a scholar of this era, also found a few books which were not found until now. Aghā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī says:

والدافع لتأليفه ثغور المؤلف على بعض الكتب المهمة التي لم تسجل في جوامع الشيعة من قبل

The cause behind its compilation was that the author found some important books, which were not previously recorded in the compilations of the Shī'ah. (*Al-Dharī'ah* 21/7)

The most amazing aspect to this is that they have considered these narrations, which have been recently discovered, as well as the narrations of *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* as indispensable. Their scholar, al-Khurāsānī says, as quoted by the author of *Al-Dharī'ah*:

أن الحاجة للمجتهد في عصرنا هذا لا تتم قبل الرجوع إلى المستدرک، والاطلاع على ما فيه ما الأحاديث

In this era of ours, the proofs of a Mujtahid cannot be complete without referring to *al-Mustadrak* and knowing the narrations in it. *Al-Dharī'ah* 2/111.

Does this mean that the views of the scholars who stated their views before *al-Mustadrak* was compiled holds no weight according to them? Read on, and you will be amazed at how many books and narrations were discovered.

commenting, “It is sufficient for our Shī‘ah”)? How did al-Ṭūsī not mention them in his book *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*, regarding which he stated that in it is all that which relates to Fiqh from the narrations of their scholars, books, and sources. He clearly stated that he did not leave out except a very small and insignificant amount.¹ It seems as if these books were compiled recently, in the era of the Ṣafawīds, and then attributed to scholars of earlier eras.

Even their four primary and initial books were not free from alterations and additions. This can be understood from the fact that it is mentioned by Aghā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī in *Al-Dharī‘ah*², Muḥsin al-‘Āmilī in *A’yān al-Shī‘ah*,³ and other contemporary Shī‘ī scholars that *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* of al-Ṭūsī contains a total of 13950 aḥādīth, whereas al-Ṭūsī himself stated in his book *‘Idat al-Uṣūl* that the narrations of *Al-Tahdhīb* are more than five thousand, which means that, at most, they were slightly less than six thousand in number.⁴ **Thus, there are strong indications that additions were made to the book along the course of the centuries, due to which the book is more than twice its original size!**

You will also find that a difference of opinion exists among them as to whether *al-Rawḍāh* (one of the books inside *al-Kāfī* – which contains a number of chapters) is from the original compilation of al-Kulaynī or it was added on later to his book *al-Kāfī*.⁵ This leaves us with the impression that it is a very normal phenomena for them to make changes and add on to books. Rather, the matter seems to be more dangerous than that. Their ‘reliable scholar’, Ḥusayn ibn Ḥaydar al-Karkī al-‘Āmilī (d. 1076 A.H.) says:

إن كتاب الكافي خمسون كتاباً بالأسانيد التي فيه لكل حديث متصل بالأئمة

1 *Al-Istibṣār* 1/2

2 *Al-Dharī‘ah* 4/504

3 *A’yān al-Shī‘ah* 1/288

4 *Al-Imām al-Ṣādiq* pg. 485

5 *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 6/188-189

Al-Kāfi is fifty books with the isnāds of every narration which goes up to the Imāms that are in it.¹

Al-Ṭūsī (d. 360 A.H.), on the other hand, says:

كتاب الكافي مشتمل على ثلاثين كتاباً، أخبرنا بجميع رواياته الشيخ..

Al-Kāfi is made up of thirty books. All its narrations were reported to us by al-Shaykh.²

Were twenty books added on to *al-Kāfi* between the fifth and eleventh century? Each book consists of many chapters, and each chapter consists of a number of narrations. Perhaps this is only natural, as the one who forges lies against Rasūlullāh ﷺ, the Ṣaḥābah, and the Ahl al-Bayt will not hesitate to forge narrations against his so-called scholars. There is no shortage of proofs regarding this.

As for the texts which appear in these books, you will see clear and irreconcilable contradictions between them. Their scholar, Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī laments:

لما آلت إليه أحاديثهم من الاختلاف والتباين والمنافاة والتضاد حتى لا يكاد يتفق خبر إلا وبازائه ما يضاده، ولا يسلم حديث إلا وفي مقابله ما ينفيه

...due to the end result of their narrations as far as differences, dissimilarities, contradictions, and opposition is concerned; to the extent that there will not be a narration, except that another narration will contradict it. There is no narration that is not opposed by another narration.

He goes on to say that these differences are more than the combined differences of all the other madh-habs. This is one of the greatest reasons on account of which

1 *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 6/114

2 *Al-Fahrist* pg. 161

their madh-hab is criticised. Some of the Shī'ah even abandon their religion, when they discover these contradictions.¹ Al-Ṭūsī unsuccessfully attempted to reconcile these differences and explain them. Instead of solving the problem, he compounded it, as he simply commented on some of the contradictions that they were based on Taqiyyah. This, he stated without any proof, besides the fact that those narrations corresponded to the narrations or views of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

The truth is that by doing so, he only broadened and solidified the gap between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah and he shut the doors of guidance upon his sect. His efforts were only related to the chapters of Fiqh. He did not attempt to reconcile the narrations of the other chapters. Our claim that his attempt was a failure is backed by the great amount of differences that are still found amongst the Shī'ah. One of their scholars, al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī (the author of *Al-Wāfī*, one of the eight books) says regarding the differences of his sect:

تراهم يختلفون في المسألة الواحدة على عشرين قولاً أو ثلاثين قولاً أو أزيد؛ بل لو شئت أقول: لم تبق
مسألة فرعية لم يختلفوا فيها أو في بعض متعلقاتها

You will see them having twenty, thirty, or more opinions. In fact, if I wish to, I can say, there is no single subsidiary matter regarding which they have not had a difference of opinion, at least regarding something related to it.²

It should be noted that their differences are not differences based on understandings and interpretations. Rather, they are differences that are a direct result of contradictory narrations and texts. When this is the case (excessive contradictions between the texts), can there be any doubt that this is false religion and that the narrations are concoctions? Allah exposes the people of falsehood. He explains:

وَلَوْ كَانَ مِنْ عِنْدِ غَيْرِ اللَّهِ لَوَجَدُوا فِيهِ اخْتِلَافًا كَثِيرًا

1 *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* 1/2-3

2 *Al-Wāfī* pg. 9 of the forward

If it had been from [any] other than Allah, they would have found within it much contradiction.¹

Some of their narrations blame these contradictions upon the excessive lies and fabrications that are attributed to the Imāms. On one occasion, Fayḍ ibn Mukhtār complained to Abū ‘Abd Allāh regarding the numerous contradictions in their narrations (as reported in their narrations) saying:

ما هذا الاختلاف الذي بين شيعتكم... إني لأجلس في حلقهم بالكوفة فأكاد أن أشك في اختلافهم في حديثهم.

What are these differences between your Shī‘ah? I sit in their gatherings in Kūfah, and I begin to doubt due to their differences in the narrations.

Abū ‘Abd Allāh replied:

هو ما ذكرت يا فيض إن الناس أولعوا بالكذب علينا.. وإني أحدث أحدهم بالحديث فلا يخرج من عندي حتى يتأوله على غيره تأويله، وذلك أنهم لا يطلبون بحديثنا ويحبنا ما عند الله وإنما يطلبون الدنيا وكل يحب أن يدعى رأساً

It is as you mentioned o Fayḍ. People revel in attributing lies to us. I transmit a narration to one of them, but he does not leave my presence until he interprets it against its meaning. This is because they do not seek, by means of our narrations and loving us, that which is by Allah, they only seek the world, and each one of them wishes to call (himself) the leader.²

The Imāms have repeatedly complained of the lies that are attributed to them.³ Connivers, conspirators, and materialistic individuals thronged around them,

1 Sūrah al-Nisā: 82

2 The references of this quotation passed on page 115.

3 The books of the Shī‘ah report from Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq that he said:

إن لكل رجل منا، رجل يكذب عليه، وقال: إن المغيرة بن سعيد دس في كتب أصحاب أبي أحاديث لم يحدث بها، فاتقوا الله ولا تقبلوا علينا ما خالف قول ربنا وسنة نبينا

For each one of us, there was a person who would attribute lies to him.

He also said:

Mughīrah ibn Sa‘īd added into my father’s books that which he did not say. Therefore, fear Allah and do not accept from us anything that opposes the word of our Rabb and the Sunnah of our Nabī.

especially Ja'far al-Ṣādiq. They would intercept the delegations that arrived from around the world to meet the Imāms, and using the names of the Imāms, they would devour their wealth. Thereafter, they would present to them fake certificates of their acceptance and they would narrate from the Imāms that which was not said by them.¹ If the Imāms ever belied them, they brushed it off saying that they were practising Taqiyyah.²

continued from page 491

Mughīrah admits his crime (as reported by the books of the Shī'ah:

دسست في أخباركم أخباراً كثيرة تقرب من مائة ألف حديث

I have shoved (added) into your narrations many narrations. They are approximately one hundred thousand in number.

They report from al-Ṣādiq:

إنّا أهل بيت صادقون لا نخلو من كذاب يكذب علينا فيسقط صدقنا بكذبه

We are a truthful household. However, we are not free of liars who forge lies in our names, thus tarnishing our honesty due to his lies.

Anas reports:

وافيت العراق فوجدت قطعة من أصحاب أبي جعفر وأبي عبد الله - عليهما السلام - متوافرين فسمعت منهم وأخذت كتبهم وعرضتها من بعد على أبي الحسن الرضا فأنكر منها أحاديث كثيرة.. وقال: إن أبا الخطاب كذب على أبي عبد الله، لعن الله أبا الخطاب، وكذلك أصحاب أبي الخطاب يسدون من هذه الأحاديث إلى يومنا هذا في كتب أصحاب أبي عبد الله - عليه السلام - فلا تقبلوا علينا خلاف القرآن I arrived at Iraq. If found a few companions of Abū Ja'far and Abū 'Abd Allah, who were surrounded by crowds. I listened to them and took their narrations. Thereafter, I presented them to Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā. He rejected any of the narrations and then said, "Abū al-Khaṭṭāb attributed forgeries to Abū 'Abd Allah. May Allah curse Abū al-Khaṭṭāb. Similarly, the companions of Abū al-Khaṭṭāb have been adding these narrations, to this day, to the books of the companions of Abū 'Abd Allah ﷺ. Therefore, do not accept anything from us that contradicts the Qur'ān."

Refer to these texts in *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* 1/174-175. If we add to these texts the testimonies of the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah, that the Rawāfiḍ were great liars and fraudsters, it becomes abundantly clear that lies were common and widespread amongst them, further, when you learn of their ignorance regarding the sciences of isnād and *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* (disparagement and commendation), you will realise the dangerous path treaded by these people, by relying on these compilations.

1 *Al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā 'Ashariyyah*, page 92 of the manuscript.

2 Refer to *Mizān al-Itidāl* 2/69-70, the biography of Zurārah. Under the discussion regarding their narrators, you will see that the scholars of the Shī'ah interpret disparagement of the narrators by the Imāms and their rejection of narrations as Taqiyyah in most cases.

Sharīk ibn ‘Abd Allāh - the judge (d. 177/8 A.H.), describes the people who would surround Ja‘far al-Šādiq and attribute narrations to him, as stated in the books of the Shī‘ah. Hereunder is the narration:

قال أبو عمرو الكشي: قال يحيى بن عبد الحميد الحماني في كتابه المؤلف في إثبات إمامة أمير المؤمنين - رضي الله عنه -: قلت لشريك: إن أقواماً يزعمون أن جعفر بن محمد ضعيف الحديث، فقال: أخبرك القصة، كان جعفر بن محمد رجلاً صالحاً مسلماً ورعاً فاكتنفه قوم جهال يدخلون عليه ويخرجون من عنده ويقولون: حدثنا جعفر بن محمد، ويحدثون بأحاديث كلها منكرات كذب موضوعة على جعفر، ليستأكلوا الناس بذلك، ويأخذوا منهم الدراهم، كانوا يأتون من ذلك بكل منكر، فسمعت العوم بذلك فممنهم من هلك ومنهم من أنكر

I said to Sharīk, “Some people are of the view that Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad is a weak narrator.”

He responded, “I will tell you the story. Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad was a pious and scrupulous Muslim. However a bunch of ignorant people thronged around him. They would enter and leave his presence and say, ‘Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad narrated to us,’ and thereafter, they would narrate strange things which were pure lies and fabrications in the name of Ja‘far, so that they could gain some food and dirhams from the people. Their narrations would include all kinds of weird information. The public heard about this. Some of them were destroyed and some of them rejected it.”¹

It seems as if these objections were only raised by the former Shī‘ah. As for the latter day Shī‘ah – especially from the Šafawid Dynasty onwards – they have accepted these fabrications in the name of Ja‘far as a portion of their fundamental beliefs, without any reservations. These narrations have such content that a person can easily point out that they are fabricated, as they contradict the basics and principles of Islam, that which is known by Tawātur, that which is unanimously upheld by all Muslims as well and they are totally illogical.

I have found in their narrations, the instruction to ignore this principle, i.e. questioning the narration due to its outrageous contents. *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* reports from Sufyān al-Simṭ:

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 208-209, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 20/202-203

قلت لأبي عبد الله - عليه السلام -: جعلت فداك؛ إن رجلاً يأتينا من قبلكم يعرف بالكذب فيحدث بالحديث فنستبشعه، فقال أبو عبد الله - عليه السلام -: يقول لك: إني قلت لليل إنه نهار، وللنهار إنه ليل، قال: لا، قال: فإن قال لك هذا إني قلته فلا تكذب به فإنك إنما تكذبني

I said to Abū ‘Abd Allāh, “May I be sacrificed for you, a man comes to us from you, who is known to be a liar, and narrates to us something that we find outrageous.”

Abū ‘Abd Allāh asked, “Does he tell you that I said regarding a night that it is a day or regarding a day that it is a night?”

I replied, “No.”

He said, “If he says this to you, then do not belie him, as you are only belying me.”¹

Another narration states:

إن حديثنا تشمئز منه القلوب فمن عرف فزيدهم، ومن أنكر فذروه

Our narrations cause the hearts to shudder. Thus, increase the one who understands and leave the one who rejects.²

Their scholar, al-Majlisī quotes 116 narrations of this meaning under the chapter, “*Their narrations are extremely difficult, their speech could be interpreted in many ways, the virtue of pondering over their narrations M submitting to them and the prohibition of rejecting them.*”³ When this is compared to the views and narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah, it becomes even clearer that these people are on the path of deviation. The Arabic idiom says, “Matters become clear by their opposites.”⁴

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 2/211-212

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 2/192

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 2/182-212

4 Look at a few examples of the views of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Al-Rabī ibn al-Khathiyam (d. 61/62 A.H.) – to whom Ibn Mas‘ūd رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said, “If Rasūlullāh ﷺ saw you, he would have loved you.” *Taqrīb Al-Tahdhīb* 1/244. He said, “Some narrations are bright, like the brightness of the day, which can be sensed, and some have a darkness like the darkness of the night. We reject (those).” Reported by al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī in *al-Kifāyah* pg. 605. *continued...*

Most of the time, they only question the text of a narration if it corresponds to the view of the Ahl al-Sunnah, who they refer to as the common masses. In such cases, they reject the narrations, as guidance (according to their narrations) is in opposing the common masses.¹ In this way, they deviate further away from the truth. It should also be noted, that by doing this, they are even opposing that which appears in their books and was said by some of their Imāms, i.e. “Do not accept from us that which contradicts the Book of our Rabb.”² However, their scholars have discarded this principle. Thus, that which the Imāms stipulated as the yardstick of truth became a target of malicious attacks and many fairy tales.

continued from page 494

Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn ‘Urwah (who authored *al-Kawākib al-Darārī* in 120 volumes, refer to al-Sakhāwī: *al-Daw’ al-Lāmi’* (d. 837 A.H.)) says, “If the heart is conscious (of Allah) and it is clean and pure, it is able to differentiate between right and wrong, truth and falsehood, and guidance and deviation, especially if is accompanied by light and understanding from the illumination of Nabī ﷺ. When this is the case, hidden matters and distortions become clear to it. It is able to distinguish between the authentic and unauthentic. If a reliable or authentic isnād is painted onto a fabricated narration, or an authentic ḥadīth is reported with a weak isnād, he will be able to discern all of this. The words of Rasūlullāh ﷺ do not remain unclear to the intelligent one who has understood them.” Al-Qāsimī quoted this from the manuscript of *al-Kawākib al-Darārī* of Ibn ‘Urwah on page 165 of *Qawā’id al-Taḥdīth*.

The scholars of ḥadīth paid attention to the texts of aḥādīth just as they paid attention to the isnāds. They have noted down signs by which a ḥadīth could be considered fabricated without even looking at the isnād. Most of the books on the science of ḥadīth have discussed this. Ibn Daqīq al-‘Īd says, “The scholars of ḥadīth often classify a ḥadīth as fabricated on the basis of aspects that relate to the narration and the words of the ḥadīth.” *Al-Iqtirāḥ* pg. 231. Ibn al-Ṣalāh mentions that sometimes a ḥadīth is recognised as a fabrication due to its text. Many times, lengthy aḥādīth are narrated – as explained by him – but the wordings and meaning thereof indicate that they are fabrications, as they are of a very poor standard. *‘Ulūm al-Ḥadīth* of Ibn al-Ṣalāh pg. 89.

Ibn al-Qayyim رحمه الله wrote a separate book on this topic, in reply to the following question which was posed to him, “Is it possible to recognise a fabrication by means of any principle, without looking at the isnād?” In response, he listed 44 principles, with 273 aḥādīth as examples, and he explained the reason behind each one of them being fabricated from the aspect of the isnād as well. The name of his book is *al-Manār al-Munīf*.

1 Refer to the discussion of *Ijmā’* in this book.

2 Refer to *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/69-71. There are many narrations of this meaning quoted there.

As for the authenticity of these narrations and the narrations which make up their compilations, their isnāds, the narrators who they have accepted as reliable narrators from their Imāms, the classifications of narrations according to them and the reasons on the basis of which texts are questioned by them; these are all aspects that require an independent book. They are absolutely important, as they will go a long way in exposing the reality of these compilations to the unwary and simple-minded. By means of such a discussion, falsehood will be stripped of its veils and the crimes of the Saba'iyyah, who were behind the creation and development of this deviance, and thereafter attributed them to scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt, will come to the fore. It is a multifaceted discussion which cannot be adequately discussed here. Nonetheless, we will indicate to a few aspects briefly.

The Authenticity of the Narrations of these Compilations

Many of the leading scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah have stated that no sect has lied as much as the Rāfiḍah and they are most vehement in rejecting the truth.¹ When Ibn al-Muṭahhar said, "They have their narrations which were reported by their reliable narrators," Ibn Taymiyyah responded:

How did you people arrive at the conclusion that those who reported these narrations in the past were reliable narrators? You people have not met them and you do not have any knowledge regarding them, as you have no books in which their details are recorded, by means of which you could have differentiated between the reliable narrators and the others. You also do not have isnāds by means of which you could have learnt who the narrators are.²

Did the scholars of Islam know about these compilations? The reality is that the Muslim ummah had no famous compilations and sources of aḥādīth besides the sources of the Muslims, which were in the forms of *Ṣiḥāḥ* (authentic compilations),

¹ *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/51 (*Mukhtaṣar Minhāj al-Sunnah* pg. 21-21), refer also to *al-Muntaqā. Mīzān al-I'tidāl* 1/27-28

² *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/110

Sunan (compiled on the format of *Fiqhī* chapters) and *Masānīd* (compiled according to teachers or narrators). According to my research, the scholars of Islam, who dealt with the matter of the *Rawāfiḍ*, such as al-Ash‘arī, Ibn Taymiyyah, and Ibn Ḥazm did not mention any of these books. There is even no mention of their most incriminating book, *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*, even though the author died in the year 329 A.H. Was this because these compilations were passed around between them in a secretive manner, or, did the scholars of Islam consider them too insignificant to pay attention to? A third possibility is that these books were all authored during the reign of the Ṣafawid Dynasty and thereafter attributed to their former scholars.

Uṣūl al-Kāfi contains a text which indicates that the books of narrations of the Shī‘ah were circulated amongst themselves in a secretive manner. This is why the isnāds are not complete, as that was the demand of Taqiyyah (according to them). The exact text of *al-Kāfi* is:

إن مشايخنا رووا عن أبي جعفر وأبي عبد الله - عليهما السلام - وكانت التقية شديدة فكتبوا كتبهم ولم ترو عنهم، فلما ماتوا صارت الكتب إلينا. (قال أحد أئمتهم): حدثوا بها فإنها حق

Our scholars have narrated from Abū Ja‘far and Abū ‘Abd Allāh. Taqiyyah was at a very high level, so they hid their books and they were not narrated from. When they passed away, their books came into our possession. (One of their Imāms says) Narrate it, as it is the truth.¹

Other narrations state that these texts should be hidden and they should not be spread among those who do not deserve it.² During the era of al-Suyūṭī, one of

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/53

2 As stated in the narration which they refer to as the scroll of Fāṭimah, at the end of which the Imām says:

لو لم تسمع في دهرك إلا هذا الحديث لكفك فُضْنُهُ إلا عن أهله

If you do not ever hear except this narration, it will be sufficient for you, so protect it, except from its people.

This text is narrated by Abū Baṣīr from Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq. Refer to *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/527-528, al-Kāshānī: *Al-Wāfi* vol. 2 pg. 72, al-Ṭabarsī: *al-Ihtijāj* 1/84-87, Ibn Bābāwayh: *Ikmal al-Dīn* pg. 301-304, al-Ṭabarsī (the author of *Majma‘ al-Bayān*): *A‘lām al-Warā* pg. 152, al-Karājīkī: *Al-Istibṣār* pg. 18.

the Rawāfiḍ began calling towards practising upon the Qur’ān alone, and leaving out the Sunnah. In refutation of this call, al-Suyūṭi wrote his book, *al-Iḥtijāj bi al-Sunnah*. The question that this raises is, why did this Rāfiḍī not call towards their compilations? These kind of acts lead us to think that they were hiding their books. Nonetheless, why were their books not as widespread and common as they have become in the recent years?

Perhaps the first time that one of their four fundamental books were pointed towards was when the book *al-Nawāqid fī al-Radd ‘alā al-Rawāfiḍ* was written, in which it was stated that among the nonsensical ideas held by the Rawāfiḍ was that they rejected the authentic books of ḥadīth which the entire ummah accepted. In contrast to that, they accept four such books in which many lies have been recorded alongside a few narrations and sayings of the Imāms.¹ The author of *al-Nawāqid* (Makhdūm al-Shīrāzī) belonged to the tenth century. However, just that he mentioned these books does not necessarily mean that they were out in the public, as he lived amongst the Rāfiḍah. Thus, he was forced to seek his knowledge from them. This is how he learnt of their matters which were hidden from others, as stated by him.

As for the authenticity of these books according to them, there are two views regarding this. One group believes that every narration in these books is authentic and every letter was said by the Imāms. The other group that there are authentic as well as unauthentic narrations therein. Their scholar, al-Mamaqānī states:

إن كون مجموع ما بين دفتي كل واحد من الكتب الأربعة من حيث المجموع متواتراً مما لا يعتره شك ولا شبهة، بل هي عند التأمل فوق حد التواتر، ولكن هل هي متواترة بالنسبة إلى خصوص كل حديث وبعبارة أخرى هل كل حديث وكلمة بجميع حركاتها وسكناتها الإعرابية والبنائية، وبهذا الترتيب للكلمات والحروف على القطع أم لا؟ فالمعروف بين أصحابنا المجتهدين الثاني كما هو قضية عدها أخبار آحاد، واعتبارهم صحة سندها أو ما يقوم مقام الصحة، وجل الإخبار على الأول كما يقتضيه قولهم بوجوب العمل بالعلم، وأنها قطعية الصدور

1 *Al-Nawāqid* pg. 109, 110

The fact that whatever is between the covers of the four books, when looking at them as a whole, is mutawātir, is something that cannot be doubted. In fact, after pondering over it, they are above the level of Tawātur. However, is each one of the narrations mutawātir? In other words, is each narration, alphabet and diacritic (whether due that being its original diacritic or the diacritic that is a result of something else) in the order that these words and alphabets are, are they definite or not? The popular view amongst our Muḥtāhid scholars is the second one, as they classify narrations as āḥād and they pay attention to the authenticity of isnād or whatever is equivalent to that. Most of the Akhbārīs, however, hold the second opinion, as is the demand of their view that it is incumbent to practise upon knowledge and that all of them were definitely stated by (the Imāms).¹

The four fundamental books hold a greater status than the Qur’ān in the sight of the Akhbārīs. Thus, they accept the narrations therein in which the authority of the Qur’ān is brought to question. They have made these books the basis of judging the Qur’ān. This is open deviation and pure kufr. As for the Uṣūlīs, or the Muḥtāhids – as they call themselves – they believe that there are āḥād narrations in these books, and they take a glance at the isnād when they wish to classify a narration. Ja’far al-Najafī – the leading scholar of the Imāmī Shī’ah of his time,² writes in his book *Kashf al-Ghiṭā* regarding the authors of the four books:

والمحمدون الثلاثة كيف يعول في تحصيل العلم عليهم، وبعضهم يكذب رواية بعض.. ورواياتهم بعضها يضاد بعضاً.. ثم إن كتبهم قد اشتملت على أخبار يقطع بكذبها كأخبار التجسيم والتشبيه وقدم العالم، وثبوت المكان، والزمان

How can one rely on the three Muḥammads when seeking knowledge? They belie the narrations of one-another. Even their narrations contradict one-another. Added to that, their books contain such narrations which are definite fabrications, such as the ones relating to anthropomorphism, *tashbīh* (likening Allah to His creation), the universe always being in existence and establishing (or confining Allah to a) time and place.³

1 *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* 1/183 (printed in 1349 A.H.)

2 *Al-Shī’ah fī al-Mizān* pg. 272 (in the footnotes)

3 *Kashf al-Ghiṭā* pg. 40

However, the authors of these four books have unequivocally stated in the introductions of their books that they have only quoted that which is authentic. Thus, the author of *Kashf al-Ghiṭā* explains:

فلا بد من تخصيص ما ذكر في المقدمات أو تأويله على ضرب من المجازات أو الحمل على العدول عما فات، حيث ذكروا في تضاعيف كتبهم خلاف ما ذكروه في أوائلها

It is necessary specify that which was mentioned in the introductions or to interpret it to be a type of figurative speech or to believe that those which did not make the grade were ignored, as they quoted in their books that which contradicts their introductory statements.¹

Thereafter, another objection is dealt with, which is far more difficult to answer compared to the previous ones, i.e. since these books were compiled from sources which were presented to the Imāms, why did they not object to the fabrications that were found in them? In fact, *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* was written during *al-Ghaybah al-Ṣughrā*, due to which it was possible for the Imām to comment on the narrations therein, especially since the book was reportedly presented to him upon which he said that it is sufficient for the Shī'ah. As for the author of *Man lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh*, he saw more than twenty years of *al-Ghaybah al-Ṣughrā*.²

The author of *Kashf al-Ghiṭā* could find no answer to this besides Taqiyyah, an answer that is used by them when all else fails. He says:

وأنه لا يجب على الأئمة المبادرة إليهم بالإنكار ولا تمييز الخطأ من الصواب لمنع التقية المتفرعة على يوم السقيفة

It is not compulsory upon the Imāms to hasten in reproaching them or to differentiate between the authentic and unauthentic, due to the prohibition of Taqiyyah which is based on the Day of Saqīfah.³

1 ibid

2 Al-Ṣadr: *al-Shī'ah* pg. 125

3 *Kashf al-Ghiṭā* pg. 40

A person may ask: Since the Uṣūlīs have adopted the methodology of authentication on the basis of isnāds, do the Shī'ah not have any expertise on the science of narrators and *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*? The answer to this question is that after reading through their books on the subject, it becomes clear that they did not have a single book regarding this, until the fourth century, in which al-Kashshī penned down a very brief book on the subject, which was of very little benefit. To make matters worse, he quoted in them contradictory reports on jarḥ and ta'dīl.¹ Their available books on narrators are none the better. They only contain biographies of certain narrators,² and there are many mistakes and ambiguities in the names of the narrators, their fathers, agnomens, and titles.³

They had no books on the sciences and principles of ḥadīth until Zayn al-Dīn al-Āmilī⁴ (d. 965 A.H.), who is referred to as *al-Shahīd al-Thānī* (the second martyr) appeared.⁵ This is a fact that is admitted in the books of the Shī'ah. Their scholar, al-Ḥā'irī says:

ومن المعلومات التي لا يشك فيها أحد أنه لم يصنف في دراية الحديث من علمائنا قبل الشهيد الثاني وإنما هو من علوم العامة

Among the well known facts which is not doubted by anyone is that nothing was written regarding the principles of ḥadīth by our scholars before al-Shahīd al-Thānī. It is from the sciences of the masses (i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah).⁶

1 As examples, refer to the biographies of Zurārah ibn A'yūn, Abū Baṣīr, Jābir al-Ju'fī etc.

2 Al-Shīrāzī: *al-Nawāqid* pg. 113

3 Al-Mamaqānī: *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* 1/177

4 *Al-Nawāqid* pg. 111-112

5 Al-Qummī: *al-Kunā wa al-Alqāb* 2/344

6 *Maqtabas al-Athar* 3/73. Al-Ḥurr al-Āmilī writes whilst penning down the biography of this scholar:

وهو أول من صنف من الإمامية في دراية الحديث؛ لكنه نقل الاصطلاحات من كتب العامة، كما ذكره ولده وغيره

He was the first from the Imāmiyyah to write on the principles of ḥadīth. However, he copied the terminology thereof from the books of the masses, as mentioned by his son and others.

Amal al-Āmāl 1/86

Another point that will be discussed later is that they had never classified narrations (as authentic and unauthentic) until the seventh century. The author of *al-Tuhfah* was of the opinion that they were motivated to write these books due to the amount of contradictions and incongruities that they had seen in their narrations. They then took help, in forming these principles, from the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah.¹

However, they also have some of their own principles which, as in all cases where they have chosen a view contrary to that of the Muslims, are misguidance through and through. One example of this is that they classify as reliable anyone who claims to have seen the awaited Mahdī in hiding, who did not ever exist.² They use this as evidence to prove that the narrator was extremely reliable, whereas the companionship of Nabī ﷺ does not add to a person's credentials in any way. In other words, they use lies and misguidance to establish that which they consider true and they consider the proofs of integrity to be signs of lies. There can be no end to the amazement of the one who sees this kind of ridiculousness.

Further, they consider as reliable people like al-Kulaynī – who narrated the fairy tales of Taḥrīf and added volumes to his book, *al-Kāfi*, by means of them. This is why al-Kāshānī (in his *Tafsīr*, *al-Ṣāfi*³), al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī (in *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*⁴) and Maḥmūd al-Najafī al-Ṭahrānī (in *Qawāmi' al-Fuḍūl*⁵) have stated that he was of the opinion that the Qur'ān was adulterated. Abū Zahrah says, “This is from his beliefs. Thus he does not belong to (the religion of) those who face the Qiblah.”⁶

1 *Al-Tuhfah al-Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* pg. 105 (of the manuscript)

2 As stated by some sects of the Shī'ah and proven by the reliable historians and genealogists, as will appear under the discussion of *al-Ghaybah*.

3 *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/52, (of the Beirut al-A'lamī print) and pg. 14 (of the Tehrani, al-Maktabah al-Islāmiyyah print).

4 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 30

5 *Qawāmi' al-Fuḍūl* pg. 298

6 *Al-Imām al-Ṣādiq* pg. 440

Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, despite the above mentioned fact regarding al-Majlisī, states that he is among the most reliable and accurate ḥadīth scholars.¹ Reflect! They wholeheartedly accept the narrations of kuffār, but reject the narrations of Muslims. According to them, whoever does not belong to the Imāmiyyah, his narrations can never be authentic – as will be discussed under the topic, ‘their definition of authentic’. The narrations of an Imāmī, even if he is disparaged by the Imām, are accepted. Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī states:

الطعن في دين الرجل لا يوجب الطعن في حديثه

Disparagement of a man on the basis of religion does not discredit his narrations.²

If these are some of their standards, what will the condition of their narrators be?

The Narrators who Appear in their Isnāds

The authors of these books did not meet any of the Imāms. Thus, their supposed narrations were reported to them by others. This raises a question; what was the condition of the men who transmitted these narrations (most of which are nothing but misguidance) to them from Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq and others? Some of the greatest scholars of ḥadīth of the Ahl al-Sunnah have testified that the Rawāfiḍ are from the worst liars, as far as narrations are concerned. Consequently, they stayed away from them. However, these testimonies hold no weight in the eyes of the Shī‘ah. They do not accept the narrations of the masses, thus it is not surprising that the criticism offered by the Ahl al-Sunnah means nothing to them.

The author of *al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah* researched the narrators of the four books using Shī‘ī sources.³ The same was done by *al-Ṣawāqī al-Muḥriqah*.⁴ Al-Ālūsī

1 *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 137

2 *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 137

3 Refer to *al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah* pg. 97 and 107 and *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* pg. 69

4 *Al-Ṣawāqī al-Muḥriqah li Ikhwān al-Shayāṭīn wa al-Zandaqah* by Naṣīr al-Dīn Muḥammad, famously known as Khawājah Naṣr Allah al-Hindī al-Makkī. Al-Shaykh Maḥmūd al-Ālusī summarised the book and named his summary *Mukhtaṣar al-Ṣawāqī*. Refer to *Mukhtaṣar al-Ṣawāqī* pg. 112.

also presented a brief summary regarding them in *Kashf Ghayāhib al-Jahālāt*.¹ Another book on the topic, which was published recently, is *Rijāl al-Shī'ah*.² The author studied many of their narrators in the light of their books. Occasionally, he added the comments of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding them as well. These are efforts that deserve to be complimented.

These studies revealed that most of the narrators in their books are either kuffār who do not believe in Allah, the Ambiyā', resurrection or the Ākhirah, people who were previously Christians and they make this known to everyone, along with adopting the dress of the Christians, who did not even claim to have spent time in the company of the Imāms and people who were openly declared as liars by Ja'far al-Ṣādiq (as admitted in the books of the Shī'ah) who said regarding them:

يروون عنا الأكاذيب ويفترون علينا أهل البيت

They narrate from us lies and they fabricate using our names, the Ahl al-Bayt.³

They have a range of different types of fabricators and misguided individuals in their books. The studies of the above mentioned authors have listed the names of the narrators who held heretical beliefs.⁴ One of the outstanding scholars of their sect (who authored two⁵ of their four foundational books and two or three of their reliable books on narrators⁶), al-Ṭūsī, by the will of Allah, made an admission whilst he was compiling a summary on their narrators. He said:

1 *Kashf Ghayāhib al-Jahālāt* pg. 10

2 By 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Zar'ī, published by Dār al-Arqām in Kuwait in the year 1403 A.H.

3 Refer to *al-Tuḥāfah* pg. 97

4 Maybe one of the faculties of Sunnah in the Islamic universities should do a thorough and comprehensive study of all the narrators of the Twelvers so that the exact reality may be known.

5 *Al-Tahdhīb* and *Al-Istibṣār*

6 *Al-Fahrist*, *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* and *Rijāl al-Kashshī* (which was systemised by al-Ṭūsī). The actual book, *Rijāl al-Kashshī* cannot be traced by the Shī'ah. Thus they only use al-Ṭūsī's version along with *Kitāb al-Rijāl* by al-Najāshī.

إن كثيراً من مصنفي أصحابنا يتحلون المذاهب الفاسدة -

Many of the authors from our scholars held deviant beliefs.¹

Despite this, he says:

إن كتبهم معتمدة

Their books are reliable.²

In essence, the only factor that holds weight is whether or not the person was a Shī'ah. If he belonged to them, nothing else mattered. The only sect whose narrations are rejected is the Zaydiyyah, just as they rejected the narrations of Zayd ibn 'Alī, a member of the Ahl al-Bayt. Al-Ṭūsī rejected their narrations in *Al-Istibṣār*, even though they are a sect of the Shī'ah. This teaches us that what they actually look for in accepting a narrator is that he should be either an Imāmī Shī'ah or an extremist.

Hence, the narrations of the Jārūdiyyah, an extremist faction of the Zaydiyyah are accepted by them, since the Jārūdiyyah declare majority of the companions of Rasūlullāh ﷺ kāfir and they reject most of their narrations. Thus, they uphold most of the views of the Imāmiyyah.³ The rest of their beliefs, irrespective of the degree of deviation therein, are absolutely irrelevant. Some of their scholars, such as al-Ghaḍā'irī and Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī have clearly stated that if a narrator is criticised on the basis of his dīn, it will not affect the authenticity of his narrations.⁴

There are some narrators who were classified as extremists by the scholars of the former times. Hence, their narrations were rejected. However, this criticism did

1 *Al-Fahrist* pg. 24-25

2 *Al-Fahrist* pg. 24-25

3 As stated by their scholar, al-Mufid in *Awā'il al-Maqālāt*. His speech was quoted on page 41.

4 *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 137

not impress the latter day Shī'ah, who presented a strange proof in favour of those narrators, i.e. the religion keeps undergoing modifications. Thus, the extremism that was disliked by the former scholars is now part of the fundamentals of the religion. This means that the standards by means of which they judge the beliefs of a narrator will keep changing as the religion progresses and changes. Al-Mamaqānī – the most senior scholar on the subject in this era - says:

إن القدماء – يعني من الشيعة – كانوا يعدون ما نعهده اليوم من ضروريات مذهب الشيعة غلوّاً وارتفاعاً، وكانوا يرمون بذلك أوثق الرجال كما لا يخفى على من أحاط خبراً بكلماتهم

The former (Shī'ah) would consider to be extremism that which we now consider as the fundamentals of the religion. On the basis of these, they would criticise the most reliable narrators. This is not hidden to the one who is well-versed with their speech.¹

There is yet another problem faced by the Shī'ah as far as this matter is concerned. There are authentic and reliable narrations reported in their books, in which a great number of the liars and fabricators, upon whose narrations the Shī'ah religion stands, have been singled out, criticised, and cursed. However, the scholars of the Shī'ah did not accept any negativity regarding them. If they were to accept this criticism, they would have become part of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and their deviant beliefs would have been abandoned. The excuse of Taqiyyah was once again the only answer they could offer to get away from this criticism. The reality is that by doing this, they are rejecting the statement of the Imām in a very subtle way and since the Shī'ah believe that rejection of a statement of the Imām is kufr, they have left the religion completely.

Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar — a contemporary scholar — admits that most of their narrators have been disparaged by the Imāms, and this has been narrated in the books of the Shī'ah. He says, whilst commenting on the criticism that was narrated regarding Hishām ibn Sālīm al-Jawālīqī:

1 *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* 3/23. Refer to Muḥibb al-Dīn Khaṭīb's comments regarding this in the footnotes of *al-Muntaqā* pg. 193.

وجاءت فيه مطاعن، كما جاءت في غيره من أجلة أنصار أهل البيت وأصحابهم الثقات والجواب عنها عامة مفهوم

Criticisms have been narrated regarding him, just as they were narrated regarding others, from the most illustrious helpers of the Ahl al-Bayt. The answers to these are common and understood.¹

Thereafter, he says:

وكيف يصح في أمثال هؤلاء الأعظم قدح؟ وهل قام دين الحق وظهر أمر أهل البيت إلا بصوارم حججهم

How can criticism of these great ones be authentic? Did the religion of truth and the matter of the Ahl al-Bayt not gain strength and publicity purely in the basis of their cutting edge evidences?²

Look at what fanaticism does to a person! They go to the extent of defending those who have been condemned by the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt, and they reject the narrations which are narrated from the scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt in which these narrators are condemned and warned about, despite the fact that these narrations are recorded in their own books. By using Taqiyyah as an excuse, they are belying the Ahl al-Bayt and believing these liars. They reject the statements of the Ahl al-Bayt, which correspond to the views of the rest of the ummah, preferring the views of their enemies and their statements. Then, they simply hoodwink their public using the excuse of Taqiyyah.

There are a group of narrators in their books who stand out on account of the excessiveness of their narrations. They are highly praised by the Imāms even though they have been cursed, declared kāfir or liars by the tongues of the Imāms, as admitted in the books of the Shī'ah. I am of the opinion that gathering the criticisms regarding the narrators in the books of the Twelvers, from the books of

1 Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Muẓaffar: *al-Imām al-ṣādiq* pg. 178

2 Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Muẓaffar: *al-Imām al-ṣādiq* pg. 178

the Shī'ah, along with that which is found in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah will play a great role in exposing the lies that have been attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt. Many of those impure narrations, which have taken the Shī'ah far away from the Ahl al-Sunnah will be flushed away by the result of this exercise.

The commoners and ignorant ones among the Shī'ah (who know nothing about their religion besides the claim by means of which their scholars keep deceiving them, i.e. Shī'ism is from the teachings of the Ahl al-Bayt) will be afforded the opportunity of seeing things the way they are. They have no clue that their narrations are taken from a bunch of liars from whom the Imāms distanced themselves and belied. Most of the general public of the Shī'ah have no idea of the details of their religion and in which direction they are being taken.

Jābir al-Ju'fī

At the forefront of these narrators is Jābir al-Ju'fī. Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī says:

روى سبعين ألف حديث عن الباقر - عليه السلام - وروى مائة وأربعين ألف حديث، والظاهر أنه ما روى
بطريق المشافهة عن الأئمة عليهم السلام أكثر مما روى جابر

He narrated seventy thousand narrations from al-Bāqir, and he narrated one hundred and forty thousand narrations. Apparently, there are no narrations directly from the Imāms more than his.¹

Thus, he takes first position as far as quantity is concerned. When we put into perspective the fact that the total number of narrations of these four books is less than 44244, we realise the true worth of his narrations. They make up most of the narrations in the books of the Shī'ah. Hence, it can be said that they are from the fundamentals of the religion. However, *Rijāl al-Kashshī* — the first of the books of the Shī'ah on the subject of narrators — reports from Zurārah ibn A'yan:

¹ *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 20/151

سألت أبا عبد الله - عليه السلام - عن أحاديث جابر؟ فقال ما رأيته عند أبي قط إلا مرة واحدة، وما دخل عليّ قط

I asked Abū ‘Abd Allāh regarding the narrations of Jābir. He replied, “I have never seen him by my father, except once and he did not ever come to me.”¹

Al-Imām al-Ṣādiq, here, belies the claims of Jābir of narrating from him and his father. Thus, how does he report so many narrations from a person who he did not meet or only met once, especially since he explicitly claims to have heard these narrations directly from them? Al-Khuṭī could find no escape route from this narration, hence he resorted to the usual:

لابد من حملة إلى نحو من التورية

It is necessary to interpret it to be a kind of dissimulation.²

He considers al-Ju‘fī to be from the reliable narrators. He says:

الذي ينبغي أن يقال: إن الرجل لابد من عده من الثقات الأجلاء

It is appropriate to say, “The man was definitely from the great and reliable ones.”³

To prove this, he quoted the statements of some of his scholars who considered him reliable, such as Ibn Qūlawiyyah, ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm, and al-Mufīd. Thereafter, he says:

ويقول الصادق في صحيحة زياد إنه كان يصدق علينا

Al-Ṣādiq says in the authentic (narration) of Ziyād, “He would report from us truthfully.”⁴

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 191

2 *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* 5/25

3 *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* 4/25

4 *ibid*

Jāmi' al-Ruwāt indicates that this narration, which al-Khuṭī classifies as authentic, was narrated through unknown people.¹ I cannot understand why they chose to interpret the first narration and accept this one without any proof. Added to that, al-Khuṭī believes that al-Mufīd was among those who regarded him to be reliable. However, al-Mufīd composed many poems from which it can be understood that al-Ju'fī was unreliable, as he would get confused.² Al-Najāshī says regarding him:

وكان في نفسه مختلطاً

He was confused.³

Hāshim Ma'rūf says:

إن جابر الجعفي من المتهمين عند أكثر المؤلفين في الرجال

Jābir al-Ju'fī was, according to most authors of the subject of narrators, among the accused.⁴

He says on another occasion, whilst passing a judgement regarding one of their narrations:

في سند هذه الرواية صباح المزني، وجابر الجعفي وهما ضعيفان، وقد ورد في جابر قبح ومدح والأكثر على أنه كان مختلطاً

The isnād of this narration contains Ṣabāḥ al-Muzanī and Jābir al-Ju'fī. Both of them are unreliable. Regarding Jābir, both criticism as well as commendation have been reported. However, most (scholars) are of the opinion that he was confused.⁵

1 Al-Ardabīlī: *Jāmi' al-Ruwāt* 1/144

2 Al-Najāshī: *al-Rijāl* pg. 100

3 Al-Najāshī: *al-Rijāl* pg. 100

4 Al-Mawḍū'āt fī al-Athār wa al-Akḥbār pg. 334

5 Al-Mawḍū'āt fī al-Athār wa al-Akḥbār pg. 184

Al-Najāshī (d. 450 A.H.), who is one of their most well versed scholars on the subject of narrators, and the author of one of their four important books on the subject mentions:

قلّ ما يورد عنه شيء في الحلال والحرام

Very rarely is something narrated from him regarding ḥalāl and ḥarām.¹

However, al-Khuṭī says:

فإن الروايات عنه في الكتب الأربعة كثيرة في الحلال والحرام

Many of the narrations from him in the four books are related to ḥalāl and ḥarām.²

This brings to our attention another fact, i.e. the man, who was a liar, also had many people lying about him. Al-Najāshī clearly states this in his book on narrators. He says:

روى عنه جماعة غمز فيهم وضعفوا منهم عمرو بن شمر، ومفضل بن صالح

A group have narrated from him, who have been criticised and considered unreliable. Among them is ‘Amr ibn Shmr and Mufaḍḍāl ibn Ṣāliḥ.³

Hāshim Ma‘rūf mentions under the biography of ‘Amr ibn Shmr:

ضعفه المؤلفون في الرجال ونسبوا إليه أنه دس أحاديث في كتب جابر الجعفي

The authors of books on narrators have considered him unreliable and they have accused him of adding narrations to the books of Jābir al-Ju‘fī.⁴

1 Al-Najāshī: *al-Rijāl* pg. 100

2 Al-Khuṭī: *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* 4/26

3 Al-Najāshī: *al-Rijāl* pg. 100

4 *Dirāsāt fī al-Ḥadīth* pg. 195

أنه كان يضع الأحاديث في كتب جابر الجعفي وينسبها إليه

He would fabricate narrations in the books of Jābir al-Juʿfi and thereafter he would attribute them to him.¹

This is another angle from which one can understand the extent to which lies are spread out in their books in the name of Jābir. Some of their narrations also have it that he was among the mentally challenged, but they claim that he adopted this kind behaviour in order to avoid being punished by the Khalīfah.² Other narrations portray him to be an expert magician, although they do not state this clearly.³

His narrations contain most of the elements of kufr that is found in the Shīʿī madh-hab. He is the one from who it is reported in *al-Kāfī* that none gathered the Qurʾān besides the Imāms and so on. He was also the first to record ‘inner’ or ‘hidden’ interpretations of the Qurʾān in a book. Some of their narrations state that it is compulsory to keep those interpretations away from others. He also had a share in the other matters by means of which Kufr and deviation were sealed into the Shīʿah religion. There is no doubt that the greatest proof of him being a liar is his narrations. The scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah have testified that he was one of the greatest liars and forgers.

Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ said:

ما رأيت أحداً أكذب من جابر الجعفي

I have not seen a greater liar than Jābir al-Juʿfī.

Ibn Ḥibbān said:

1 Hāshim Maʾrūf: *al-Mawḍūʿāt wa al-Āthār* pg. 234

2 Refer to *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 194-195

3 Refer to the extra-ordinary feats that are reported by them regarding him in *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 197

كان سبئياً من أصحاب عبد الله ابن سبأ، وكان يقول: ”إن علياً عليه السلام يرجع إلى الدنيا

He was a Sabaʿī, from the companions of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’. He would say,
“Alī عليه السلام will return to this world.”

Jarīr ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd said:

لا أستحل أن أحدث عن جابر الجعفي هو كذاب يؤمن بالرجعة

I consider it impermissible for me to narrate from Jābir al-Juʿfī. He is a great liar, who believes in reincarnation.

Zāʿidah said:

رافضي يشتم أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

He was a Rāfiḍī who would revile the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم.¹

Zurārah ibn Aʿyan

One of the accomplices of Jābir was a narrator by the name of Zurārah ibn Aʿyan (d. 150 A.H.). Their scholars, such as al-Ṭūsī,² al-Najāshī,³ Ibn al-Muṭahhar⁴ and others⁵ have considered him reliable and among the six companions of Abū Jaʿfar and Abū ‘Abd Allāh, whose speech the group has agreed⁶ to believe.⁷ Many of his narrations appear in the books of the Shīʿah. There were many others who also joined these two forgers in their mission.⁸ Hence, al-Ṭūsī says;

1 Refer to al-ʿUqaylī: *al-Duʿafā al-Kabīr* 1/196, Ibn Ḥibbān: *al-Majrūhīn* 1/208, *Mizān al-Iʿtidāl* 1/379

2 *Al-Fahrist* pg. 104, *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* pg. 201 and 350

3 *Rijāl al-Najāshī* pg. 132 and 133

4 *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 76

5 Al-Ḥurral-ʿĀmilī: *Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah* 20/196, al-Ardabīlī: *Jāmiʿ al-Ruwāt* 1/324

6 Here they are using *ijmā* as a proof, whereas their belief is that it cannot be a proof.

7 *Muʿjam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* 7/219

8 *Al-Fahrist* pg. 104

They have many narrations, principles, and books.¹

Al-Khuṭī mentioned the total amount of Zurārah's narrations in the four books, saying:

وقع بعنوان زرارة في إسناده كثير من الروايات تبلغ ألفين وأربعة وتسعين مورداً، فقد روى عن أبي جعفر - عليه السلام -، ورواياته عنه تبلغ ألفاً ومائتين وستة وثلاثين مورداً، وروى عن أبي جعفر وأبي عبد الله - عليهما السلام - ورواياته عنهما بهذا العنوان تبلغ اثنين وثمانين مورداً، وروى عن أبي عبد الله - عليه السلام - ورواياته عنه بهذا العنوان، وقد يعبر عنه بالصادق - عليه السلام - تبلغ أربعمائة وتسعة وأربعين مورداً، وروى عن أحدهما عليهما السلام ورواياته عنهما بهذا العنوان تبلغ ستة وخمسين مورداً

The isnāds of many narrations mention the name of Zurārah. The total amount of these narrations is 2490. He reported a total of 1236 narrations from Abū Ja'far عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. He also reported "from Abū Ja'far and Abū 'Abd Allāh". He reports 82 narrations from them in this manner. His narrations from Abū 'Abd Allāh, who is also referred to as al-Ṣādiq, reach a total of 449. He narrates from "one of them" a total of 56 narrations.²

These are their claims. However Sufyān al-Thawrī says regarding Zurārah:

ما رأى أباً جعفر

He did not see Abū Ja'far.³

Sufyān ibn 'Uyaynah said, when he was told that Zurārah ibn A'yan narrates a book from Abū Ja'far:

ما هو ما رأى أباً جعفر ولكنه كان يتبع حديثه

1 Al-Fahrist pg. 104

2 Al-Khuṭī: Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth.

3 Refer to Lisān al-Mizān 2/474

What (book) is that? He did not see Abū Ja'far. However, he would search for his narrations.¹

Mizān al-I'tidāl has it that Zurārah attributed to Abū Ja'far the knowledge of the inhabitants of Jannah and Jahannam. He said to Ibn al-Sammāk, 'When you meet him, ask him whether I am from the people of Jannah or Jahannam.' When this reached Ja'far, he said, "Inform him that he is from the people of hell, as whoever attributes the knowledge of this to me, will be from its dwellers."² However, one of their contemporary scholars says:

لم نجد أثراً مما نسبوه إلى كل من زرارة بن أعين، ومحمد بن مسلم، ومؤمن الطاق وأمثالهم، مع أنا قد استفرغنا الوسع والطاقة بالبحث عن ذلك وما هو إلا البغي والعدوان

We have not found any trace of that which they have attributed to Zurārah ibn A'yan, Muḥammad ibn Muslim, Mu'min al-Ṭāq, and their likes, even though we exerted ourselves in trying to find something. It is nothing other than injustice and enmity.³

He wishes to establish that there is no basis for the criticism that is reported regarding Zurārah, and it is based purely on the hatred of the opposition. He asserts that he searched for this in all of their sources and he went the extra mile in doing so, yet he found no trace of it. Can this be true? To answer this question, we will have to visit some of their most reliable sources on the subject of narrators. Thereafter, we will realise the truth or falsity of his statement. There is no other way out, as the belief of Taqiyyah upheld by the Shī'ah simply does not allow one to believe anything that emanates from them.

The first source that deserves to be consulted regarding this matter is the reliable books of narrators of the Shī'ah. *Al-Fahrist* of al-Ṭūsī informs us that he belonged to a Christian family. His grand-father, Sansan was a monk in the Roman lands,

1 *Lisān al-Mizān* 2/474

2 *Mizān al-I'tidāl* 2/69-770

3 *Al-Mūsawī: al-Murāja'āt* pg. 313

and his father was a Roman slave of a man from the Banū Shibyān.¹ It seems as if the effects of Zurārah on the Shīʿī religion was greater than that of Ibn Saba. In fact, Abū ʿAbd Allāh said:

ما أحدث أحد في الإسلام ما أحدث زرارَةَ من البدع عليه لعنة الله

None have introduced into Islam the innovations which Zurārah introduced.
May the curse of Allah be upon him.²

He also says:

زرارة شر من اليهود والنصارى، ومن قال: إنّ مع الله ثالث ثلاثة

Zurārah is worse than the Jews, the Christians, and those who say that Allah is but one of a trinity.³

Al-Kashshī reports that Abū ʿAbd Allāh cursed him three times,⁴ and said:

إن الله نكس قلب زرارَةَ

Undoubtedly, Allah turned around the heart of Zurārah.⁵

He reported a few more narrations in which he was criticised. It is due to this, as stated by al-Kashshī, that Zurārah would say:

وأما جعفر فإن في قلبي عليه لفتة

As for Jaʿfar, I have some disinclination for him in my heart.

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Fahrist* pg. 220, ibn al-Nadīm: *al-Fahrist* pg. 220. However, *al-Fahrist* of Ibn al-Nadīm states that his grandfather's name was Sanbas.

2 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 149

3 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 160

4 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 149

5 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 160

The one who narrates this from Zurārah explains:

لأن أبا عبد الله أخرج مخازيه

Since Abū ‘Abd Allāh revealed his faults.¹

The brazenness of Zurārah in respect of Abū ‘Abd Allāh reached the point, as stated in *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, where he would belie his statements and talk ill of him.² He would fabricate statements and insist that they were the statements of Abū ‘Abd Allāh. *Rijāl al-Kashshī* states:

عن محمد بن أبي عمير، قال: دخلت على أبي عبد الله - عليه السلام - فقال: كيف تركت زرارة؟ قلت: تركته لا يصلى العصر حتى تغيب الشمس فقال: فأنت رسولني إليه فقل له: فليصل في مواقيت أصحابي فإني قد حرقت. قال: فأبلغته ذلك فقال (يعني زرارة): أنا والله أعلم أنك لم تكذب عليه، ولكن أمرني بشيء فأكره أن أدعه

Muḥammad ibn Abī ‘Umayr says, ‘I entered the presence of Abū ‘Abd Allāh عليه السلام, who said, “How did you leave Zurārah?”

I replied, “I left him in the condition that he would not perform ‘Aṣr until the sun had set.”

Thereupon, he said, “You are my messenger to him. Tell him that he should perform it at the times of my companions, for I have been burnt.”

I conveyed this to him.

He responded, “By the oath of Allah, I know that you are not lying about him. However, he commended to me to do something, so I do not wish to leave it.”³

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 144-145

2 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 157

3 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 143, al-Ḥurri al-‘Āmilī: *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 3/113, al-Khoṭ: *Mu’jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* 7/222

He claims that Ja'far al-Ṣādiq commanded him to perform 'Aṣr only after the sun sets, whereas he was completely innocent of this. This is the description of Zurārah in the books of the Shī'ah. Despite this, the senior scholar of the Shī'ah in this era says that after exerting himself, he could find no criticism of Zurārah. Was this hidden from him or does Taqiyyah give him the license to say anything without being reproached?

How is it that the scholars of the Shī'ah consider Zurārah to be reliable after all of this criticism, curses and the verdict of kufr that was passed regarding him by the one who they believe is infallible, especially since both, al-Kashshī as well as Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifāh al-Ṭūsī have reported it?¹ The answer to this question is offered by al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī. He says:

روي أحاديث في ذمه (أي زارة) ينبغي حملها على التقية، بل يتعين، وكذا ما ورد في حق أمثاله من أجلاء الإمامية

Narrations have been reported in criticism of him. It is appropriate to take this to be Taqiyyah. Rather, it is the only answer. The same can be said about that which was reported regarding his likes from the luminaries of the Imāmiyyah.²

To prove this, they quote a narration of theirs from Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Zurārah and his two sons Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, who narrate from 'Abd Allāh ibn Zurārah:

قال لي أبو عبد الله (جعفر الصادق): "اقرأ على والدك السلام وقل له: إنما أعيبك دفاعاً مني عنك، فإن الناس والعدو يسارعون إلى كل من قربناه وحمدنا مكانه، لإدخال الأذى فيمن نحبه ونقربه، فيذموه لمحبتنا له وقربه ودنوه منا، ويرون إدخال الأذى عليه وقتله

Abū 'Abd Allāh (Ja'far al-Ṣādiq) said to me, "Covey greetings to your father and say to him, 'I only criticise you to protect you. The people and the

1 This is so because *Rijāl al-Kashshī* was authored by al-Kashshī and it was systemized by al-Ṭūsī. The copy which is common is the edition of al-Ṭūsī, as the original book is lost.

2 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 20/196

enemy hasten to harm all those who we draw close and praise and love. They criticise them due to our love for him and closeness to him. They wish to harm him and kill him.”¹

They use this as proof, without paying any attention to the fact that the sons narration was criticised, as he was defending his father. Further, if this criticism really was done on the basis of Taqiyyah, why did they go to the extent of cursing them and calling them kuffār? Another fact to consider is that Ja‘far was quite honoured in his society, so how is it possible that his associates and those who he loved would be harmed? If Ja‘far really was protecting Zurārah, why did Zurārah falsely claim that Ja‘far commanded him to perform ‘Aṣr after sunset and why did he belie him and speak ill of him? Was this also Taqiyyah? One scholar of the Shī‘ah attempted to get away from these narrations, in which Zurārah is criticised, by taking half of them to be Taqiyyah² and criticising the isnāds of the rest.

After looking through his criticisms of some of the narrators, I have seen that they are not in conformity with that which appears in their books regarding narrators. As an example, he rejected one of the narrations in which Zurārah was criticised on the basis that Jibrīl ibn Aḥmad, as he claimed, was unknown.³ The reality is that he is not unknown to the Shī‘ah. Al-Ardabīlī says:

كان مقيماً بكش كثير الرواية عن العلماء بالعراق وقم وخراسان

He was resident of Kash. He narrated many narrations from the scholars of Iraq, Qum, and Khurasān.⁴

Added to the above, he scrutinises the narrations in which Zurārah is criticised but overlooks those in which he is praised. This is open partiality. Their scholars apply this rule to all those who are criticised by their Imāms and they accept

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 138, *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 20/196, *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* 7/145

2 *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* 7/245

3 *Mu‘jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* 7/241

4 *Jāmi‘ al-Ruwāt* 1/146

their narrations. Other examples of these narrators are Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Marwazī,¹ Ismāʿīl ibn Jābir al-Juʿfī,² Burayd ibn Muʿāwiyah al-ʿIjlī,³ Ḥarīz ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Sijistānī,⁴ etc.

There is no doubt that there can be absolutely no certainty of Taqiyyah in these conditions. At least, the Shīʿah should have deliberated and kept silent regarding these narrators. The Shīʿah do not accept the criticism of the Ahl al-Sunnah, as they are regarded by them to be ‘the opposition’. However, here they are even rejecting that which is reported from their Imāms, claiming that these were said to please the Ahl al-Sunnah and keep their peace with them. Thus, the truth has been covered up and the Shīʿī religion now stands upon the whims of their scholars and the lies of their narrators.

Types of Narrations – According to the Shīʿah

Although the compilations of the Shīʿah on the subject of narrators were extremely belated, and they did not serve their purpose, the one who reads the books of latter day Shīʿah (such as *Mirʾāt al-ʿUqūl* by al-Majlisī) or the books of

1 Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī says, al-Kashshī and others have narrated criticism as well as commendation regarding him. The basis of the criticism is perhaps that which will appear under the discussion of Zurārah (i.e. Taqiyyah). *Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah* 20/127, *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 559-562, *Jāmiʿ al-Ruwāt* 1/48-49.

2 Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī says, “There is some criticism regarding him which has a weak isnād and it is not very clear. The interpretation of it will appear under Zurārah.” *Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah* 20/139, *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 199

3 Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī said, “A luminary from the luminaries of our scholars. He was reliable and he was a jurist. Al-Kashshī counted him among the people of *ijmāʿ* (i.e. those whose narrations the Shīʿah have all agreed to accept)’. There is some criticism regarding him, the explanation of which will appear under Zurārah. *Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah* 20/145-146, *Rijāl al-Najāshī* pg. 87, *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 26-27, *Jāmiʿ al-Ruwāt* 1/117-119, *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 148 (which quotes Abū ʿAbd Allah to have said, “May Allah curse Burayd.”)

4 Al-ʿĀmilī says, “He is a reliable Kūfī. There is praise regarding him. There is also criticism, which is interpreted to be Taqiyyah for the same reason that appears under Zurārah.” *Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah* 20/162, *Rijāl al-Najāshī* pg. 111, *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* pg. 181, *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 63, *Jāmiʿ al-Ruwāt* 1/182-187

present day Shī'ah (such as *al-Shāfi' fī Sharḥ Uṣul al-Kāfi*) will see that at times they classify certain narrations as authentic and others as unreliable. However, they do not take it upon themselves to do so in many of their books. We have already explained that this (authentication) is the view of one of their sects, i.e. the Uṣūlīs.

The Shī'ah, all along, were ignorant on this subject. Hence, the Ahl al-Sunnah would take them to task on the basis of their ignorance. The question now arises, when did the Shī'ah begin classifying narrations, and what was the cause behind this? I have learnt, after studying their works on the science of *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* that they classify narrations as,

- ṣaḥīḥ (authentic),
- ḥasan (good),
- muwaththaq (passible),
- and ḍa'īf (weak).¹

1 Ṣaḥīḥ: That narration, the isnād of which is continuous until it reaches the infallible one, by the transmission of an Imāmī, who is a person of integrity, from one who is like him in all the generations. Ḥasan: The isnād is continuous, just like the above, except that the narrator should be praised, even though his integrity is not mentioned. This should be found in all the generations or in some of them, with the rest being like that of ṣaḥīḥ.

Muwaththaq: An isnād which has in it a narrator who was been declared reliable by the scholars, but he held incorrect beliefs.

Ḍa'īf: None of the conditions of the above three are found. It includes a criticised or an unknown narrator or even someone of a lower standard.

Mursal: That which is narrated from the infallible one by one who did not meet him.

Zayd al-Dīn al-Āmilī: *al-Dirāyah* pg. 19, 21, 23, 24, 47. Refer also to al-Mamaqānī: *Miqbās al-Hidāyah* pg. 33-35, Bahā al-Dīn al-Āmilī: *al-Wajīzah* pg. 5.

It should be noted that the 'infallible one', as explained previously, is not only Rasūlullāh ﷺ according to them. The Imāms are also infallible, a trait that is confined to the ambiyā' alone. Further, for the narration to be classified as authentic or acceptable, it is a condition, according to them, that the narrator should be an Imāmī. The narrations of non-Imāmīs are not accepted, as stated by their scholar, Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, who says:

¹These terms were introduced into their books at a very late stage. Perhaps this matter needs a little more deliberation, as far as it being a new subject for them (as I understand) is concerned. I have not seen anyone before me discussing this.

According to my observation, the Shī'ah began dividing and classifying narrations as authentic, weak, etc., in the seventh century, even though the study of narrators had existed amongst them since the fourth century. This came about at around the same time that Ibn Taymiyyah exposed their ignorance and cluelessness concerning the subject of narrators, just as he exposed them for using narrations from the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah which, in many cases, were classified by the scholars as unauthentic or fabricated. Another complaint that he had against them was that they would keep quoting from unreliable books.

Thus, did the Shī'ah come to realise their weaknesses in these aspects and consequently attempt to improve themselves, or did they realise that by using the methodology of the Ahl al-Sunnah in these matters, they could find a way out of all the kufr and idiocy that is found in their books? This means that as soon as

1

لا تقبل رواية الكافر وإن علم من دينه التحرز عن الكذب

The narrations of an infidel cannot be accepted, even if it is known that abstention from lies is part of his religion.”

Similarly:

المخالف لا يقبل روايته أيضاً لاندراجة تحت اسم الفاسق

The narrations of the one who opposes cannot be accepted, as he is among the transgressors.
(Ibn al-Muṭahhar: *Tahdhīb al-Wuṣūl* pg. 77-78)

It should also be noted that they consider as disbelievers all those who not belong to the Shī'ah. Al-Mamaqānī says:

والأخبار في فسقهم بل كفرهم لا تحصى كثرة

The narrations which highlight their transgression, or rather, their disbelief, are too many to count. (*Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* 3/207)

For further details, refer to the discussion regarding Imāmah in this book. Nonetheless, they are selective as far as applying this principle is concerned. The author of *al-Tuḥfah*, as well as others, including their brothers from the Akhbārīs, have exposed their inconsistencies in this matter.

anyone questions one of their narrations, they can immediately respond that it is a fabrication, as Taqiyyah allows and encourages them to lie as much as they can!

Undoubtedly, the timing between the exposure by Ibn Taymiyyah and their adoption of these classifications reveal to us that they were definitely affected by his writings. Hereunder is their admission:

أن هذا الاصطلاح مستحدث في زمن العلامة

This terminology (ṣaḥīḥ, ḍaʿīf, etc.) were invented in the era of al-ʿAllāmah (al-Ḥillī).¹

When the title ʿAllāmah appears without any person's name after it, it is a reference to Ibn al-Muṭaḥhar al-Ḥillī, in refutation of whom Ibn Taymiyyah authored his book. This deduction is strengthened further by the following statement of the author of *Al-Wāfi* regarding Ibn al-Muṭaḥhar:

أول من اصطلاح على ذلك وسلك هذا المسلك

(He was) the first to coin these terms and adopt this methodology.²

With this being the case, is it not quite apparent that Ibn Taymiyyah and his book, *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, were largely responsible for the adoption of this system by the Shīʿah? Does this not reveal to us that Ibn Muṭaḥhar introduced this methodology to his people on account of the criticism that was levelled against them by Ibn Taymiyyah? In the following statement, Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī admits that the Shīʿah only introduced these terms into their religion and began taking an interest in isnāds due to the criticism levelled against them by the Ahl al-Sunnah. He says:

والفائدة في ذكره... دفع تعبير الشيعة بأن أحاديثهم غير معتمدة، بل منقولة من أصول قدمائهم

1 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 2/102, Al-Kāshānī: *Al-Wāfi* (the second introduction).

2 *Al-Wāfi* 1/11

The benefit of mentioning it (the isnād) is that it dispels the criticism against the Shī'ah, that their narrations have no reporters to them, but rather, they are copied from the books of their predecessors.¹

This text indicates that their narrations did not have isnāds to them and thus they were criticised by others. Therefore, they began mentioning isnāds along with their narrations. This means that the isnāds which appear with their narrations were, in fact, concocted later on and added to the statements in the books of their predecessors merely to avoid the criticism of the Ahl al-Sunnah (that the narrations are not reported with an unbroken isnād). Hence, it is not far-fetched that the one who undertook the task of concocting these isnāds added to them names of people who did not even exist.

I have already expounded upon the fact that they attribute books and narrations – under the discussion regarding the book of *Sulaym ibn Qays* (which was their first book) – to people who did not exist. One of their scholars, whilst admitting that the book of *Sulaym ibn Qays* was a fabrication stated:

والحق أن هذا الكتاب موضوع لغرض صحيح نظير كتاب الحسنية، وطراف بن طاوس، والرحلة المدرسية

The truth is that this book was fabricated for a valid reason, just like *Kitāb al-Ḥasaniyyah*, *Ṭarā'if ibn Ṭāwūs*, and *al-Riḥlah al-Madrasīyyah*.²

We have already explained that *Sulaym ibn Qays* was a name behind which there was no person. Further, I have seen the author of *al-Ḥūr al-ʿĪn* quoting a very important testimony of one of their scholars concerning this. He says:

قال السيد أبو طالب إن كثيراً من أسانيد الاثني عشرية مبنية على أسماء لا مسمى لها من الرجال، قال: وقد عرفت من روايتهم الكثيرين من كان يستحل وضع الأسانيد للأخبار المنقطعة إذا وقعت إليه. وحكي عن بعضهم: أنه كان يجمع روايات بزرجمهر، وينسبها للأسانيد يضعها، فقبل له في ذلك، فقال: ألحق بالحكمة بأهلها

1 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 20/100

2 Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sha'rānī: *Ta'līqāt 'Ilmiyyah* ('*alā Sharḥ al-Kāfi li al-Māzindarānī*) 2/373-374

Al-Sayyid Abū Ṭālib¹ says, “Many of the isnāds of the Twelvers are based upon names behind which there are no individuals. Added to that, I have realised that some of those who narrated excessively (from their narrators) regarded it permissible to concoct isnāds for the narrations which had no isnāds, if they came his way. It is also reported from one of them that he would collect narrations in Zajamhar and thereafter attribute them to the Imāms by means of isnāds which he would fabricate. He was approached regarding this, to which he responded, “I attribute wisdom to its people.”²

According to them one of their narrators is Ḥaydar ibn Muḥammad ibn Nu‘aym al-Samarqandī. They state regarding him:

روى جميع مصنفات الشيعة وأصولهم... وروى ألف كتاب من كتب الشيعة

He reported all the writings of the Shī‘ah as well as their foundational books, and he reported a thousand of the books of the Shī‘ah.³

If this had any truth to it, his name would have appeared in all the books on narrators and this ‘fact’ would have been recorded in the books of history as well. However, I neither found any mention, nor any indication towards it in these books. The theory that their isnāds have no reality to them is supported by yet another text, which appears in the most authentic of their books. They state:

إن مشايخنا رووا عن أبي جعفر وأبي عبد الله - عليهما السلام -، وكانت التقية شديدة فكتبوا كتبهم ولم ترو عنهم، فلما ماتوا صارت الكتب إلينا“. ولما سألوا إمامهم عن ذلك قال: “حدثوا بها فإنها حق

Our scholars have reported from Abū Ja‘far and Abū ‘Abd Allah. However Taqiyyah was at a very high level at that time. Therefore, they hid their books away and abstained from reporting from them. When they died, the

1 Abū Ṭālib Yahyā ibn Ḥusayn ibn Hārūn al-Ḥasanī stated this in his book *al-Da‘āmah*. He died in the year 424 A.H. Refer to *Mu‘jam al-Mu‘allifīn* 13/192-193

2 *Al-Ḥūr al-‘Īn* pg. 153

3 *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 20/185

books came into our possession. They asked their Imām regarding this, to which he replied, “Narrate it, for it is the truth.”¹

This is an important confession that their narrations do not have proper isnāds. What assurance do they have that these books, which reached them after era of fear and taqiyyah (as indicated to in the above confession) were not fabricated by some heretic whose goal was to distance them from the domain of *al-Jamā'ah* (the majority) by attributing these fabrications to the noble Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt? This is a very realistic possibility, which is strengthened when we consider the abundance of their narrations, especially those narrations which attempt at criticising that which is honoured most by the Muslims, i.e. the Book of Allah ﷻ. This is something that is not found in any other sect, whether they are innovators or disbelievers. It is only the Shī'ah who have the audacity to state this.

Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī, at another juncture, emphasises that the ‘new terminology’ (ṣaḥīḥ, ḍaʿīf, etc.), which was introduced by Ibn Muṭaḥhar al-Ḥillī was an attempt to follow the Ahl al-Sunnah. He says:

والاصطلاح الجديد موافق لاعتقاد العامة واصطلاحهم، بل هو مأخوذ من كتبهم كما هو ظاهر بالتبع

The new terminology is on par with the beliefs and terminologies of the masses. In fact, it is taken from their books, as is apparent (for the one who looks) through them.²

This text leaves us with certainty regarding two things, i.e. the Shī'ah were quite late in their adoption of this methodology, and the greater concern amongst them was to save their religion from the criticism of the opposition, instead of actually identifying the status of the narrations. Thus, the science of *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* (commendation and disparagement of narrators), in their books, is

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/53

2 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 20/100

filled with contradictions and inconsistencies. Al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī (one of their scholars) says:

في الجرح والتعديل وشرابطهما اختلافات وتناقضات واشتباهاات لا تكاد ترتفع بما تطمئن إليه النفوس
كما لا يخفى إلى الخبير بها

Al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl and its conditions have many contradictions, differences, and ambiguities; which cannot be cleared in a convincing manner. This is obvious to the one who is well-versed with the subject.¹

These decisive confessions by al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī and al-Kāshānī would have never surfaced, had it not been for the differences between the Uṣūlīs and the Akhbārīs, in which (as we have seen) Taqiyyah is greatly side-lined, especially since the Shī'ah have (as stated in *al-Kāfī*) two qualities, viz, love for frivolities and brazenness.² Thus, these confessions explain that the isnād is among the specialities of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and the Shī'ah imitated them and adopted it as a measure to protect their religion from criticism. Furthermore, the fact that Ibn al-Muṭahhar, who was severely criticised by Ibn Taymiyyah, introduced these terms into the Shī'ī religion highlights the extent to which they were affected by it.

However, these terms have been reduced by them to another type Taqiyyah, which they use to hide their extremism. Whenever they are questioned regarding any extremism that appears in their works, they try to brush it off by claiming that their authentic narrations state otherwise. This can be seen in the books of many of their contemporary scholars. If these scholars were to apply the principles of authentication objectively, most of their narrations would go to waste. This was admitted by their scholar, Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī, who says:

والواجب إما الأخذ بهذه الأخبار، كما هو عليه متقدمو علمائنا الأبرار، أو تحصيل دين غير هذا الدين، وشرعية
أخرى غير هذه الشريعة، لنقصانها وعدم تمامها، لعدم الدليل على جملة من أحكامها، ولا أراهم يلتزمون
شيئاً من الأمرين، مع أنه لا ثالث لهما في البين، وهذا بحمد الله ظاهر لكل ناظر، غير متعسف ولا مكابر

1 *Al-Wafī* 1/11-12

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/221-22

It is compulsory to either accept all these narrations, as was done by the predecessors from our righteous scholars, or to end up with a religion and a constitution besides this one, which is incomplete, as there are no proofs for a large number of its laws. I do not see them accepting either of these two options, even though a third option does not exist. Praise is due to Allah, this is evident to anyone who looks into it, as long as he is not stubborn and proud.¹

This is an important text, which reveals the reality of their narrations in the light of their version of the science of *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl*. If they were to apply it objectively, most of their narrations would be declared unreliable or fabricated. If they wish to accept their narrations, they have no other option but to blind themselves from the reality and accept it without any questions, as was done by their predecessors (who accepted all the lies and tales in their books). On the other hand, if they are not prepared to totally discard their intellect, they should search for a religion other than Shī'ism, as it is incomplete and cannot fulfil the requisites of a religion.

If we add to these confessions the other confession which appears in their books, i.e. that they were ignorant regarding the rites of Ḥajj as well as ḥarām and ḥalāl until the appearance of Abū Jā'far² (added to the fact that in his era as well as the era of his son, there were many who would fabricate narrations in the names of the Imāms) it becomes glaringly evident to us that most of their narrations were concoctions and lies. If the principles of *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* are applied, they will return to the state in which they found themselves before the era of Abū Jā'far. They will not be able to learn the dīn except by means of the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Unfortunately, they chose not to apply their principles. Thus, we see them authenticating the book *Nahj al-Blāghah*, to the extent that one of their contemporary scholars said:

1 *Lu'lu'at al-Baḥrayn* pg. 47

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 2/20. The entire text was quoted previously.

إن الشيعة على كثرة فرقهم واختلافها متفقون متسلمون على أن ما نهج البلاغة هو من كلام أمير المؤمنين - رضي الله عنه - اعتماداً على رواية الشريف ودرايته ووثاقته.. حتى كاد أن يكون إنكار نسبته إليه - رضي الله عنه - عندهم من إنكار الضروريات وجحد البديهيّات اللهم إلا شاذاً منهم.. وأن جميع ما فيه من الخطب والكتب والوصايا والحكم والآداب حاله كحال ما يروى عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم

The Shī'ah, despite their abundant sects and differences, unanimously accept all of that which is in *Nahj al-Balāghah* to be from the speech of Amīr al-Mu'minīn عليه السلام, relying wholly upon the narrations, trustworthiness and reliability of al-Sharīf... Denying their attribution to him ('Alī) is like denying the obvious, except for a few of them. All the sermons, books, laws, and etiquettes mentioned therein are of the same condition as that which is reported from Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم.¹

The reality, on the other hand, is that the book *Nahj al-Balāghah* is questionable on the basis of both, its isnād as well as its contents. It was compiled three and a half decades after the demise of Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī عليه السلام, without any isnād attached to it. The Shī'ah claim that it was compiled by al-Sharīf al-Raḍī², who was not considered a reliable person by the scholars of ḥadīth as far as the matters of his beliefs were concerned. This was in the case when he produced an isnād. What can be said about his book, which does not even have an isnād? Nonetheless, the scholars of ḥadīth are of the opinion that the book *Nahj al-Balāghah* was, in fact, compiled by his brother, 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn.³ Ibn Taymiyyah says:

The scholars are aware that most of the sermons in this book are fabrications in the name of 'Alī عليه السلام. This is why most of them are not found in any of the earlier books and they do not have any known isnāds.⁴

1 Al-Hādī Kāshif al-Ghīṭā: *Midrāk Nahj al-Balāghah* pg. 190-191

2 Muḥammad ibn Ḥusayn ibn Mūsā al-Riḍā Abū al-Ḥasan. Al-Dhahabī says, 'A extremist Rāfiḍī.' *Mīzān al-I'tidāl* 3/523

3 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn al-'Alawī al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā aal-Mutakallim al-Rāfiḍī al-Mu'tazilī. He died in the year 436 A.H. refer to *Mīzān al-I'tidāl* 3/124

4 Ibn Taymiyyah: *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/24, *al-Muntaqā min Minhāj al-I'tidāl* pg. 430

There are many other signs which indicate that this book was a fabrication.¹ However, we cannot afford to discuss all of them here. The crux of this discussion is that the Shī'ah have stipulated the condition that the isnād should be unbroken and continuous, yet they authenticated this book, which has no sign of it. Their scholars (who accepted the methodology of authentication) have always been guilty of not upholding their own rules. Al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī states regarding their scholar, al-Ṭūsī:

يقول: هذا ضعيف، لأن رواه فلان ضعيف، ثم نراه يعمل برواية ذلك الرواي بعينه، بل برواية من هو أضعف منه في مواضع لا تحصى. وكثيراً ما يضعف الحديث بأنه مرسل ثم يستدل بالحديث المرسل، بل كثيراً ما يعمل بالمراسيل ورواية الضعفاء، ويرد المسند ورواية الثقات

He says, "This is unauthentic because so and so narrator in it is unreliable." Thereafter we see him practising upon the narration of that very narrator. In fact, he practises upon the narrations of those who are much weaker than him on countless occasions. Many a time he declares a narration weak on account of it being *mursal* (a narration whose chain of narration does not reach the Imām), but there are many instances in which he practises upon *mursal* narrations and the narrations of those who are unreliable. On the other hand, he rejects narrations which have complete isnāds and the narrations of reliable narrators.²

Al-Baḥrānī's (d. 1186 A.H.) confession, in which he admits that true application of their principles of al-Jarh wa al-Ta'dīl (despite its flaws) will result in most of their narrations being discarded, is outclassed by the claim of their scholar, al-Ardabīlī (d. 1101 A.H.). After compiling his book *Jāmi' al-Ruwāt* (in the eleventh

1 Refer to Ibn Taymiyyah: *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/159, *al-Muntaqā min Minhāj al-I'tidāl* pg. 508, 509, al-Dhahabī: *Mizān al-I'tidāl* 3/124 (under the biography of 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā), Ibn Ḥajar: *Lisān al-Mizān* 4/223, *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* pg. 36, Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb: *Hāshiyat Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* pg. 58, *Hāshiyat al-Muntaqā* pg. 430, Aḥmad Amīn: *Fajr al-Islām* pg. 178, Aḥmad Zakī ūt: *Tarjamat 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib* pg. 125-162, al-Zu'bī: *al-Bayyināt fī al-Radd 'alā Abāṭil al-Murāja'āt* pg. 36-40, Majallat al-Muqtaṭaf Rabī al-Awwal 1331 A.H., Al-Wādi'ī: *Riyād al-Jannah* pg. 162-163.

2 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 20/111

3 Muḥammad ibn 'Alī al-Ardabīlī al-Gharawī al-Ḥā'irī.

century), he stated that the status of as many as twelve thousand narrations from the scholars of the past will now change. His exact words are:

بسبب نسختي هذه يمكن أن يصير قريباً من اثني عشر ألف حديث أو أكثر من الأخبار التي كانت بحسب المشهور بين علمائنا - رضوان الله عليهم - مجهولة أو ضعيفة أو مرسله معلومة الحال وصحيحة لعناية الله تعالى، وتوجه - كذا - سيدنا محمد وآله الطاهرين

By virtue of this writing of mine, it is possible that twelve thousand or more narrations, which were famously known among our scholars to be unknown, mural, or unreliable, will now be known and authentic. This is due to the help of Allah ﷻ and the attention of our master Muḥammad ﷺ and his pure family.¹

The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* uses this statement to support his claim, saying that it is not impossible that the narrations of Taḥrīf were considered unauthentic by their former scholars on account of their lack of knowledge of the authentic isnāds, by means of which they would have considered all the narrations to be authentic.²

Al-Majlisī, in his book, *Mir'āt al-'Uqūl*, declares some narrations of *al-Kāfī* as unauthentic, even though he says:

فإننا لا نحتاج إلى سند لهذه الأصول الأربعة، وإذا أوردنا سنداً فليس إلا للتيمن والتبرك والافتداء بسنة السلف³

We do not require isnāds for these four foundational books. When we mention the isnāds, it is only to acquire blessings and to follow the path of the predecessors.³

This is a strange contradiction. Another scholar of theirs, Hāshim Ma'rūf states:

1 Al-Ardabīlī: *Jāmi' al-Ruwāṭ* (the introduction)

2 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 354

3 *Al-Imām al-Ṣādiq* pg. 470-471

أن اتصاف هذا المقدار من مرويات الكافي بالضعف لا يعني عدم جواز الاعتماد عليها في أمور الدين، ذلك لأن وصف الرواية بالضعف من حيث سندها، لا يمنع من قوتها من ناحية ثانية كوجودها في أحد الأصول الأربعمئة، أو في بعض الكتب المعتمدة.. أو لكونها معمولاً بها عند العلماء وقد نص أكثر الفقهاء على أن الرواية الضعيفة إذا اشتهر العمل بها والاعتماد عليها تصبح كغيرها من الروايات الصحيحة، وربما تترجح عليها في مقام التعارض

Classifying this amount of narrations from *al-Kāfī* as unauthentic¹ does not mean that it is impermissible to rely upon them in the matters of religion. If the narration is classified unauthentic from the perspective of its isnād, it is still possible that it is authentic on account of other reasons, such as; it is found in one of the four hundred foundational books or any other reliable book or it is practised upon by the scholars. Most of the jurists have clearly stated that if practising upon an unreliable narration becomes common, and it is relied upon, it becomes like the other narrations, i.e. it is authentic. At times, it even takes precedence over them, when they contradict one-another.²

It is for this reason that their scholar, al-Shaʿrānī stated that although most of the isnāds of *al-Kāfī* are unreliable, its content is authentic.³ It should be noted that these are attempts by them to stay away from applying the principles laid down for them by Ibn al-Muṭahhar in the seventh century, which lays to waste most of their narrations, as admitted by al-Baḥrānī. However, they needed to prove that these narrations are authentic; otherwise there would be no point in having them recorded in ‘the authentic books’, the foremost of which is *al-Kāfī* – which was presented to their Mahdī. Thus, they hunted for any other sign to substantiate this.

Additionally, he stated that the narrations of *al-Kāfī* can be classified as authentic

1 They state that that *al-Kāfī* contains 9485 ḍaʿīf narrations, 5072 ṣaḥīḥ ones, 144 ḥasan narrations, 178 muwaththaq narrations and 302 qawī narrations.

Refer to *al-Dharīʿah* 17/245-246, al-Nūrī: *Mustadrak al-Wasāʾil*

2 Hāshim Maʾrūf: *Dirāsāt fī al-Ḥadīth wa al-Muḥaddithīn* pg. 137

3 Al-Shaʿrānī: *Taʾālīq ʿIlmiyyah* 2/123

if they are from one of the four hundred foundational books.¹ However, their scholars are of the opinion that the four books as well as the other reliable books, such as *al-Khiṣāl*, *al-Amālī*, *Madīnat al-‘ilm*, etc., are sourced from the four hundred uṣūl.² So, how did they state that a narration of *al-Kāfī* should be declared authentic if it appears in one of the four hundred uṣūl, whereas the entire book is supposedly taken from them?

The Status of the Imāms Regarding whom the Shī‘ah Make their Claims

It is no secret that most of the narrations in all of the books of the Shī‘ah are attributed to the Twelve Imāms, with most of them being attributed to Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq. Only a handful of narrations (which cannot be found without difficulty) are attributed to the Rasūl of Guidance ﷺ. Al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī has even indicated that they stay away from the narrations of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, fearing that they might be from the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah.³

Thus, this sect has no interest in the aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. They do not wish to differentiate between the authentic and unauthentic narrations. Also, they have distanced themselves from the sayings of the Ṣaḥābah and the Tābi‘īn, due to which they are unaware of their methodology and interpretations. In other words, they do not wish to resolve their matters by referring to Allah and His Rasūl.⁴

Rather, their interest lies in that which they falsely attribute to some members of the Ahl al-Bayt, not even all of them. Hence, al-Ṭūsī rejected the narrations of Zayd ibn ‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn.⁵ As if that was not enough, they even declared a large

1 The scholars of the Shī‘ah claim that their predecessors would rely upon four-hundred compilations which they referred to as ‘al-Uṣūl’. Thereafter, these books were summarized and gathered in certain books, the best of which are the four books. *Al-Wasā’il* 20/67

2 ibid

3 *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 20/391

4 *Mihāj al-Sunnah* 3/40

5 Refer to *Al-Istibṣār* 1/66

number of the members of the Ahl al-Bayt as kāfir, simply because they did not accept the Imāmah of the Twelve Imāms.¹ If only they chose to confine themselves to the narrations of Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī عليه السلام, or the mursal narrations of the Tābi'īn such as 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn! Instead, they chose individuals who appeared much later, such as the 'Askarīs, and claimed that anything that was said by them was said by Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم as well.

It is undisputable that the 'Askarīs were no different to the rest of the Hāshimites in their era. They had no such knowledge by means of which they could have been distinguished from the rest, and due to which others would be dependent upon them. The people of knowledge would not study under them, but rather, they would study under the scholars of their time. This is unlike the cases of 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn, his son Abū Jā'far, and his grandson Ja'far ibn Muḥammad, who were distinguished scholars, from whom students would acquire knowledge, just as they would acquire it from the rest of the scholars.

No influential or well-known scholar is reported to have studied under the 'Askarīs. Despite this, these people wish to equate their speech to the speech of the Rasūl, who was sent to guide the entire universe. They wish to equate the speech of these individuals to the Qur'ān and the mutawātir sunnah. Who would accept this and base his religion upon such statements, except the one who is far away from the path of the people of knowledge and īmān?²

Ibn Ḥazm commented on this claim of the Rāfiḍah saying:

As for those who appeared after Ja'far ibn Muḥammad, we cannot trace any knowledge to them; neither narrations, nor verdicts. This is despite their era being close to ours. If they did possess this knowledge, it would have been known, just as the narrations of Muḥammad ibn 'Alī, his son Ja'far, and others are from whom people narrate are known.³

1 Refer to *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/372, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/112-114

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/40-41

3 *Al-Fiṣal* 4/175

As for those who appeared before Ja‘far, they possessed the same knowledge as their contemporaries. Ibn Taymiyyah says regarding those whose words are taken to be equivalent to the word of Allah and His Rasūl ﷺ by the Rawāfiq:

Among them is one who was a rightly guided Khalīfah, whose obedience was binding, just like the obedience of the Khalīfah caliphs before him was binding. He was ‘Alī عليه السلام. Then, there were some who were leading spiritual and academic personalities, the likes of ‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn, Abū Ja‘far al-Bāqir, and Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣādiq. They deserve all that which is deserved by the leaders in knowledge and religion. Besides them, there are those who were of a lesser standing.¹

On another occasion, he explains who those ‘who were of a lesser standing’ were. He explains:

Mūsā ibn Ja‘far did not narrate many aḥādīth. He reported from his father and his brother ‘Alī reported from him. Al-Tirmidhī and Ibn Mājah have recorded narrations from him. As for those after Mūsā, no knowledge was acquired from them. There are no narrations from them in the famous books of ḥadīth, no verdicts from them in those places where the verdicts of the predecessors are mentioned, or any tafsīr etc., reported from them. However, they did have the virtues and merits that they ought to have had. May Allah be pleased with them.²

It is as if Ibn Taymiyyah made a correction to the statement of Ibn Ḥazm, as he added Mūsā ibn Ja‘far, explaining that a narration of his is recorded from him in the books of ḥadīth. However, his narrations are not many in number. Al-Dhahabī counted his narrations in the six books and concluded that he has two narrations in al-Tirmidhī and Ibn Mājah.³ However, a narration from his son, ‘Alī ibn Mūsā al-Riḍā, is also recorded in *Ibn Mājah*, as pointed out by al-Dhahabī and Ibn Ḥajar

1 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā* 19/69

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/155

3 *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā* 6/270

(who indicated towards it by a ‘Qāf’ under his biography).¹ Al-Mizzī has pointed out that it is only one narration.²

This narration is reported from Abū al-Ṣalt al-Harawī³, whose narrations cannot be used as proof. Al-Dāraquṭnī says, “(He is) a wretched Rāfiḍī. He is accused of concocting the narration of īmān in the heart.”⁴ This is the very narration which appears in *Sunan Ibn Mājah* from ‘Alī ibn Mūsā through Abū al-Ṣalt. It is for this reason that Ibn al-Sam‘ānī said, “The problem with the narrations of ‘Alī al-Riḍā is the narrators. Only the ones whose narrations are discarded have reported from him.”⁵ Ibn Ḥajar says regarding al-Riḍā, “He was outstandingly honest; however, those who narrate from him cause the problem.”⁶

Perhaps this is what Ibn Taymiyyah was referring to when he said, “None of the scholars of ḥadīth reported anything from him, and not a single ḥadīth is reported from him in the books of the Sunnah. It is only Abū al-Ṣalt al-Harawī and his likes who narrate writings from his forefathers, in which there are such lies, from which Allah exonerated all the truthful ones.”⁷

1 Al-Dhahabī: *al-Kāshif* 2/296, Ibn Ḥajar: *Taqrīb Al-Tahdhīb* 2/44-45

2 Al-Mizzī: *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 2/993

3 Refer to *Sunan Ibn Mājah* 1/25-26 number 45. Ibn al-Jawzī declared it a fabrication. *Al-Mawḍū‘āt* 1/128-129. Refer also to al-Sakhāwī: *al-Maqāṣid al-Ḥasanah* pg. 140, al-Kinānī: *Tanzīh al-Sharī‘ah* 1/151-152, al-Būṣīrī: *Miṣbāḥ al-Zujāj* pg. 12

4 *Mizān al-I’tidāl* 2/616

5 *Al-Ansāb* 6/134, *Tahdhīb Al-Tahdhīb* 7/389

6 *Taqrīb Al-Tahdhīb* 2/45

7 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/156. *Tahdhīb Al-Tahdhīb* contains examples of these ridiculous lies that Abu al-Ṣalt reports from ‘Alī al-Riḍā. *Tahdhīb Al-Tahdhīb* 7/388-389. One example is their narration in which he says:

السبت لنا، والأحد لشييعتنا، والاثنين لبني أمية..

Saturday is ours, Sunday is for our Shī‘ah, and Monday is for the Banū Umayyah. (*Tahdhīb Al-Tahdhīb* 7/388-389)

His narrations are reported in the reliable books of the Shī‘ah. Refer to ‘*Uyūn al-Akhbār* pg. 207, *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 8/258

As for those who appeared after ‘Ali al-Riḍā, who was the eighth Imām of the Twelvers, there are no narrations from them in the books of ḥadīth. When Ibn al-Muṭaḥhar al-Ḥillī claimed that “the masses (Ahl al-Sunnah) have many narrations from Ḥasan al-‘Askarī (the eleventh Imām)”, Ibn Taymiyyah rejected it saying, “This is a baseless claim and a definite lie. There are no famous narrations in the books of the scholars which are reported from Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī al-‘Askarī by the scholars who were well known for narrations in his era.”

He further says, “The teachers of the authors of the books of Sunnah (al-Bukhārī, Muslim, Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasa’ī, and Ibn Mājah) were of the same era as him and they were not far from him. Al-Ḥāfiẓ Abū al-Qāsim Ibn ‘Asākir had gathered the names of the teachers of all of them (al-Bukhārī, Muslim, etc.) but none of them have narrated from Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī al-‘Askarī, even though they narrated from thousands of others. How can it then be said that the masses have many narrations from him? Where are all of these narrations?”¹ I have seen that Ibn Ḥajar mentioned, under the biography of Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī al-‘Askarī that Ibn al-Jawzī considered him to be a weak narrator in his book *al-Mawḍū‘āt*.² Look at the difference between this and the view that his speech is no different to revelation!

Ibn Ḥazm took the Shī‘ah to task on the basis of a historical fact, i.e. one of these Imāms lost his father at the age of three. Thus, he says, “We ask them: Where did this toddler acquire all the knowledge of sharī‘ah from, as he was way too young for his father to have taught it to him?” The only answer that they may offer is; through revelation. This would mean that he is a Nabī, which is clear-cut kufr. They will not go to the extent of claiming that he was a Nabī and that he was granted the miracle of his speech being corrected. Thus, these are baseless claims. None of them have ever come close to being a reality. Yes, they may claim that he was inspired. Anyone can make the same claim (thus, it holds no weight).”³

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/163-164

2 *Lisān al-Mizān* 2/240

3 *Al-Fiṣal* 4/172

It seems as if Ibn Ḥazm is predicting that which the Shī'ah were soon to add to their religion, or he was exposing that which they tried to hide. They have it in their books that the Imām receives both, inspiration as well as revelation, as explained previously. Their narrations also emphasise that children were Imāms. The following appears in *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*:

عن ابن بزيع قال: سألته يعني أبا جعفر - رضي الله عنه - عن شيء من أمر الإمام، فقلت: يكون ابن أقل من سبع سنين؟ فقال: نعم، وأقل من خمس سنين

Ibn Bazīgh reports, "I asked him (Abū Jā'far عليه السلام) regarding a certain matter of the Imām. I said, 'Can he be a child who is younger than seven?'"

He replied, 'Yes, (he can be) even younger than five years old.'¹

They state that al-Jawwād became an Imām at the age of five.² The pinnacle however, is the awaited one, to whom they have attributed narrations when he was only a day old. These have been quoted previously. These fairy-tales are all that a person needs in order to realise the extent of the nonsense in their narrations. The law which is established by the Qur'ān, the mutawātir Sunnah, and ijma' is that it is incumbent to take care of the likes of these children as far as their wealth and lives are concerned. The responsibility of caring for them and protecting their wealth lies on the shoulders of the closest Islamic guardian. They are not even commanded to perform a single ṣalāh, as they are under the age of seven (which is the age after which they should develop the habit of ṣalāh).

When this is the law regarding them, how does anyone take them to be infallible Imāms, whose words are no different, in status, to the words of Allah and His Rasūl? Who holds such beliefs, besides the one whose heart is blinded by Allah? Even some of the sects of the Shī'ah (as stated in their books regarding sects) have rejected the Imāmah of al-Jawwād, due to his tender age. They were of the opinion that being mature was one of the conditions of Imāmah.

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/383-384, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/103

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/103

To prove this, they state that if Allah commanded people to obey one who is a minor, then he would have also made minors accountable for their deeds (which is obviously not the case). Just as it impossible that a minor is taken to task, similarly it is impossible that he is able to judge between people, as there are some cases which are obvious, but others are intricate. In the same way, it cannot be fathomed that he understands the intricacies of the laws of dīn and all else that was taught by Nabī ﷺ, which encompasses all the worldly and religious needs of the ummah until the day of Qiyāmah.¹

The result of taking toddlers as Imāms was that they were forced to accept the narrations of liars who attributed to the Imāms that which was not said by them, as they only met them in the state of their childhood. Al-Mamaqānī states under the biography of Mu'allā ibn Khanīs:

إن المعلى قتل لأربع وثلاثين ومائة، والكاظم طفل لأنه ولد سنة ٢٨ أو ٢٩ ومائة، فعمره عند قتل المعلى
ست أو سبع سنين

Mu'allā was killed in the year 134 A.H, when al-Kāẓim was still an infant, as he was born either in the year 128 or 129 A.H. Thus, his age at the time of Mu'allā's killing was six or seven.²

However, Mu'allā reports from al-Kāẓim, and the Shī'ah accept these narrations. Al-Mamaqānī explains this:

وفيه أن صغرهم لا يمنع من علمهم بالأحكام، ألا ترى إلى إمامة الجواد وهو صغير فيمكن أن يكون
المعلى سأل الكاظم وهو صغير فروى عنه

Their childhood does not negate their knowledge of the laws. Do you not see the Imāmah of al-Jawwād, who was a child? It is thus possible that Mu'allā asked al-Kāẓim whilst the latter was a child, and thereafter reported from him.³

1 Al-Nawbakhti: *Firaq al-Shī'ah* pg. 87-88, Al-Qummī: *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* pg. 90

2 *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* of al-Māmaqānī (under the biography of Mu'allā)

3 ibid

Further, they do not look for an isnād for that which they report from some of the scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt, to ascertain whether or not it was actually said by him. This is because they have no knowledge regarding the ḥadīth and isnād.¹ The reality is that they do not have any Imāms who speak to them directly, besides their scholars who devour their wealth without any valid basis and stop them from the path of Allah.² This is why they found books that were attributed to their former scholars, without any isnād to them — as they feared the Islamic Khilafah (as stated by them). Thereafter, they simply told their people to practise upon them as they are authentic, as explained previously.

Their scholars would then accept all the contents of these books without scrutinising them. It was only in the seventh century that Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī began classifying their narrations as ṣaḥīḥ, ḍaʿīf etc., and the first book on the subject of ḥadīth terminology that was authored by them appeared as late as the tenth century. This too, was not appreciated by all of them, and thus we find the Akhbārīs opposing them. They expose and disgrace their brothers by admitting that this is nothing more than an attempt at imitating the Ahl al-Sunnah and copying their principles.

Many Muslim luminaries have testified that lying is an integral part of Shīʿī civilisation, and they believe it to be part of their religion, by virtue of the doctrine of Taqiyyah (as explained previously). Nonetheless, their fanaticism reached its peak when they accepted the narrations of established liars, some of whom even rejected one or more of the Imāms, simply because they upheld other beliefs of the Shīʿah, yet they rejected the narrations of those who were praised by Allah and His Rasūl ﷺ, i.e. the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.

There is no limit to the absurdity of their principles of commendation (of a narrator). Whoever claims that he saw the awaited one, attributes excessive lies

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/246

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/134, *al-Muntaqā* pg. 163

to the Ahl al-Bayt¹, claims that he was guaranteed by them a place in Jannah² or done anything extreme regarding them³ is considered by them to be reliable and trustworthy. On what stretch of logic is a person declared reliable due to the amount of lies that he speaks?

1 This is because they narrate from their Imāms:

اعرفوا منازل الناس على قدر روايتهم عنا

Know the stature of people on the basis of the amount of their narrations from us. (*Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/50)

2 The Imāms guarantee of Jannah is one of the highest forms of commendation. Refer to *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 20/118, number 20, *Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 381, number 714, pg. 567, number 1073, *Rijāl al-Hillī* pg. 98, 158. One example of these guarantees is that which they report under the biography of Abū Maḥmūd, regarding whom Al-Kashshī says:

روى عنه أحمد بن محمد بن عيسى مسائل موسى - رضي الله عنه - (يعني موسى الكاظم) قدر خمس وعشرين ورقة، وعاش بعد الرضا
Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ṭsā reported from him the verdicts of Mūsā (i.e. al-Kāẓim). They amount to approximately twenty five pages. He lives after al-Riḍā.

He is declared reliable based on the following alleged narration of al-Kashshī:

عن إبراهيم ابن أبي عمود، قال: دخلت على أبي جعفر - إلى أن قال - فقلت: جعلت فداك تضمّن لي عن ربك أن تدخلني الجنة؟ قال:
نعم، قال: فأخذت رجله فقبلتها

Ibrāhīm ibn Abū Maḥmūd reports, "I entered upon Abū Ja'far... 'May I be sacrificed for you, can you guarantee me on behalf of your Rabb that you will enter me into Jannah?'"

He replied, 'Yes.'

Thereupon, I grabbed his leg and kissed it. (*Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 567)

The one who holds such beliefs regarding the Imāms is undoubtedly out of the fold of Islam, yet this very statement is taken by them as a reason to accept his narrations. Ja'far al-Ṣādiq declared those who hold these types of beliefs regarding them as disbelievers. Refer to *Mizān al-I'tidāl* 1/69-70.

3 Regarding a narrator of theirs, who was referred to as Wāṣil, *Rijāl al-Hillī* states that he is authentic. This is substantiated by the author from the following narration of al-Kashshī:

حدثني واصل، قال: طليت أبا الحسن - رضي الله عنه - بالنورة، فسددت مخرج الماء من الحمام إلى البئر، ثم جعلت ذلك الماء، وتلك
النورة، وذلك الشعر فشربته كله

Wāṣil reported to me, I sought Abū al-Ḥasan by the plants. I blocked off the drain pipe of the bathroom, which was connected to the well, and thereafter gathered the water, the hair, and the plants; and drank all of it. (*Rijāl al-Kashshī* pg. 614)

Ibn al-Muṭahhar says:

وهذا يدل على علو اعتقاده، والسند صحيح

This indicates the high level of his beliefs and the isnād is authentic. (*Rijāl al-Hillī* pg. 177-178)

Moreover, if a person studies the men in their isnād, in the light of that which appears in their books regarding narrators, he will see that the senior narrators and those who narrate excessively have been severely criticised and cursed by the Imāms. The Imāms would declare them liars and distance themselves from them. All of this is narrated in the books of the Shī'ah. However, the scholars of the Shī'ah disregard the sentiments of the Imāms on the feeble excuse of Taqiyyah, which, in these instances, is an excuse that is weaker than a spider's web.

Besides the isnād, the texts of their narrations are highly problematic. As we have seen from the chapters and sections of this book, many of their narrations are obvious lies, for the one who has any amount of knowledge regarding Islam. This becomes all the more evident to the one who reads through *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*, *al-Biḥār*, *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, *al-'Ayyāshī*, *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, etc. This is because they contain criticism of the Book Allah, defilement of the Sunnah of His Rasūl ﷺ, and they declare the best of people after the ambiyā', as well as all of those who follow diligently in their footsteps; to be out of the fold of Islam. To make matters worse, they then try to establish such beliefs which cannot be proven in any way from the Qur'ān. Thus, a study of the texts of their narrations is sufficient to realise the status thereof.

وكل متن يباين المعقول، أو يخالف المنقول، أو يناقض الأصول فاعلم أنه موضوع على الرسول

Know well that any text which is definitely contradictory to the intellect, contradicts that which was passed on (i.e. the Qur'ān and Sunnah) or goes against the basics is a fabrication against the Rasūl ﷺ.¹

1 Ibn al-Jawzī: *al-Mawḍū'āt* 1/106

Chapter Three

Their Beliefs Regarding Ijmā' (consensus of the Ummah)

Ijmā' is the third principle of the Ahl al-Sunnah, after the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Rasūl ﷺ. It is relied upon in religious matters.¹ Hence Ibn Taymiyyah says, "Whoever accepts the Book of Allah, the Sunnah, and Ijmā' is from the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah."² The Ahl al-Sunnah weigh all sayings and actions related to religion on the basis of these three sources.³ They are referred to as *al-jāmā'ah* (the group) as *al-Jamā'ah* denotes unanimity, the opposite of which is alienation.⁴ However, the *ijmā'* that is being referred to here is the *ijmā'* of the pious predecessors, as after them the ummah split into many different factions.⁵ The Shī'ah, on the other hand, do not accept the *ijmā'* of the Ṣaḥābah, pious predecessors, or the rest of the ummah as a valid *ijmā'*. Their beliefs regarding this are totally different. We will discuss them below.

1. Proof Lies in the Statement of the Imām, not in Ijmā'

The books of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding principles have it that the Shī'ah accept Ijmā' as a proof, not because of it being the consensus of the Ummah, but rather on account of it including the view of the Imām. According to them, his statement independently serves as proof.⁶ Below, we will study the viewpoint of the Shī'ah from their sources. Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī says:

الإجماع إنما هو حجة عندنا لاشتماله على قول المعصوم، فكل جماعة كثرت أو قلت كان قول الإمام في جملة أقوالها، فإجماعها حجة لأجله لا لأجل الإجماع

1 Refer to al-Ghazālī: *al-Muṣṭaṣfā* 1/173, al-Amidi: *al-Iḥkām fī Uṣūl al-Aḥkām* 1/200, *Majmū' Fatāwā* 3/157 al-Shāfi'ī: *al-Risālah* pg. 403, 471, Ibn 'Abd al-Barr: *al-Tamhīd* 4/267

2 *Majmū' Fatāwā* 3/346

3 *Majmū' Fatāwā* 3/157

4 However the word *Jamā'ah* is used (literally) for any group who gets together. *ibid*

5 *Ibid*.

6 Al-Isnawi: *Nihāyat al-Sūl* 3/247

Ijmā' is only a proof according to us due to the fact that it includes the view of the infallible one. The *ijmā'* (consensus) of any group, small or large, which includes the Imām, is proof, not on account of the *ijmā'* that took place, but rather on account of him (being amongst them).¹

The same was stated by many of their scholars.² Thus, in essence, *ijmā'* cannot serve as a proof without the presence of the 'infallible' Imām. In other words, in *ijmā'* his view is taken as proof, instead of the actual consensus. Therefore, the reality is that they do not accept *ijmā'* as a proof. They only accept the view of the Imām as proof. This means that their claim of acceptance of *ijmā'* as a proof is nothing more than a meaningless claim.

There is no meaning to the statement of Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī who said, "Ijmā' is a proof according to us." If he wished to say something meaningful, he should have rather said, "Ijmā' does not count as proof according to us, as proof lies in the statement of the Imām." This is the actual position of their madh-hab. The Imām, according to them, is equal to or greater than the Nabī. They believe that he receives whisperings in his ear, the angel comes to him, he sees figures who are greater than Jibrīl and Mīkā'il and a number of other beliefs which we have already discussed under the section of the Sunnah.

When this is what they believe, they will have no need for *ijmā'* as long as the Imām is amongst them, just as the Ṣaḥābah did not need *ijmā'* whilst Rasūlullāh ﷺ was present amongst them. They have a 'Nabī' in every era, who is referred to as the Imām. His statements are regarded as proof, instead of *ijmā'*. This is why they say:

ونحن لما ثبت عندنا بالأدلة العقلية والنقلية كما هو مستقصى في كتب أصحابنا الإمامية أن زمان التكليف لا يخلو من إمام معصوم حافظ للشرع يجب الرجوع إلى قوله فيه، فمتى اجتمعت الأمة على قول كان

1 Ibn al-Muṭahhar: *Tahdhīb al-Wuṣūl ilā 'Ilm al-Uṣūl* pg. 70 (printed in Tehran in the year 1308 A.H.)

2 Refer to al-Mufid: *Awā'il al-Maqālāt* pg. 99-100, *Qawāmi' al-Fuḍūl* pg. 305, Ḥusayn Ma'tūq: *Al-Marjī' iyyah al-Dīniyyah al-'Ulyā* pg. 16, as well as their other books on the subject.

داخلاً في جملتها لأنه سيدها، والخطأ مأمون على قوله، فيكون ذلك الإجماع حجة. فحجية الإجماع عندنا إنما هو باعتبار كشفه عن الحجة التي هي قول المعصوم

Since it is proven, according to us, on the basis of intellectual as well as textual proof (as the books of our Imāmī scholars cover this in a comprehensive manner) that an era in which people are responsible for their actions cannot be void of an infallible Imām, who carries the sharīah in his bosom, it is thus incumbent to refer to his statements regarding it. Thus, whenever the ummah unites upon a view, and his view is included in there (as he is the master of the ummah and he is infallible), this ijmā' will be counted as proof. Therefore, ijmā' serves a proof according to us, only because it reveals to us the actual proof, which is the view of the infallible one.¹

The earth can never be void of an Imām, as they claim:

لو خلت الأرض من إمام لساخت

If the earth is empty of an Imām, it will sink.²

This means that the value of ijmā' will never be realised. If a person ponders over their definition of the sunnah and their definition of ijmā', he will realise that there is no difference between the two, except their names. The sunnah, according to them, is the sayings of the infallible one, and valid ijmā', according to them, is that which reveals the view of the infallible one. Their inclusion of ijmā' among the sources of sharīah (in their books on the principles of Islam), whereas it does not really have any meaning, is indeed illogical. They have stated that the views of their jurists, even if they are one hundred in number, hold no weight. One of their scholars writes:

أما الإجماع فعندنا هو حجة بانضمام المعصوم، فلو خلا المائة من فقهاءنا عن قوله لما كان حجة، ولو كان في اثنين لكان قولهما حجة، لا باعتبار اتفاقهما بل باعتبار قوله

1 Al-Nahārīrī: *Ma'ālim al-Dīn* pg. 406

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/179

Ijmā‘, according to us is a proof when it includes the infallible one. Thus, if a hundred of our jurists do not hold his view, it will not be proof. However, if (his view is found among) two of them, it will be proof, not on account of their agreement, but rather on account of his view.¹

This means that ijmā‘ serves no purpose according to them. They have merely given another name to that which they refer to as the Sunnah. It seems as if this objection was raised against the Shī‘ah in the early eras. Their scholars quote al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, who stated:

إننا لسنا بادئين بالحكم بحجية الإجماع حتى يرد كونه لغوًا، وإنما بدأ بذلك المخالفون، وعرضوه علينا، فلم نجد بداً من موافقتهم عليه.. فوافقناهم في أصل الحكم لكونه حقاً في نفسه، وإن خالفناهم في علته ودليله

We were not the first ones to take ijmā‘ as a proof, due to which the objection of it being meaningless could be raised against us. It was the opposition who started this and presented it to us. We had no option but to agree with them... Thus, we agreed with them regarding the actual law, as it, in itself, is the truth. However, we disagree with them as far as its reason and proof is concerned.²

In other words, they are merely imitating the Ahl al-Sunnah. The author of *Qawāmi‘ al-Fuḍūl* goes on to state:

تندعم فائدة الإجماع لو علم حال شخص الإمام خروجاً أو دخولاً أو حال قوله تقيّة أو نحوها، لكن الذي يسهل الخطب هو أن عقد باب الإجماع منهم دوننا كي يتجه علينا ذلك

The object of ijmā‘ will be lost if the position of the Imām is known; whether he is in or out of it, or whether he agreed on account of Taqiyyah or not. However, the matter is made easy by the fact that they are the ones who introduced the concept of ijmā‘, not us. Thus the objection cannot be raised against us.³

1 *Ma‘ālim al-Dīn* pg. 405

2 *Qawāmi‘ al-Fuḍūl* pg. 305

3 *Qawāmi‘ al-Fuḍūl* pg. 305

The Ahl al-Sunnah have kept up to their principles. Ijmā' is given its due importance. The question is, if your belief of Imāmah demands that a concept like ijmā' cannot exist, why did you accept it in the first place? Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar offers another bizarre explanation:

إن الإجماع لا قيمة علمية له عند الإمامية ما لم يكشف عن قول المعصوم... فإذا كشف على نحو القطع عن قوله فالحجة في الحقيقة هو المنكشف لا الكاشف، فيدخل حينئذ في السنة، ولا يكون دليلاً مستقلاً في مقابلها

Ijmā' has no academic value according to the Imāmiyyah, as long as it does not reveal the view of the infallible one. If it reveals his view in a definite manner, then the proof is actually in his view and not in ijmā'. Thus, it will then fall under the category of the Sunnah, and it will not be an independent proof like the Sunnah.¹

Riḍā al-Ṣadr says:

وأما الإجماع عندنا - معاشر الإمامية - فليس بحجة مستقلة تجاه السنة، بل يعد حاكياً لها، إذ منه يستكشف رأي المعصومين عليهم السلام

Ijmā', according to us (the Imāmiyyah), is not an independent proof like the Sunnah. Rather, it informs about it. The view of the infallible one is revealed by it.²

A contemporary scholar of theirs, Muḥammad Jawād al-Mughniyah writes:

أن ثمة تبايناً بين موقف متقدمي الشيعة وبين موقف متأخريهم في مسألة الإجماع، حيث اتفق المتقدمون (من الشيعة) على أن مصادر التشريع أربعة: الكتاب، والسنة، والإجماع، والعقل، وغالوا في الاعتماد على الإجماع حتى كادوا يجعلونه دليلاً على كل أصل وكل فرع، وعد المتأخرون لفظ الإجماع مع هذه المصادر ولكنهم أهملوه، بل لم يعتمدوا عليه إلا منضماً مع دليل آخر في أصل معتبر

There is a difference between the stance of the former and the latter scholars of the Shī'ah on the matter of ijmā'. The former scholars (of the

1 Al-Muẓaffar: *Uṣūl al-Fiqh* 3/92

2 Riḍā al-Ṣadr: *al-Ijtihād wa al-Taqlīd* pg. 17

Shrāh) were unanimous that there are four sources of Islāmic law; the Qur'ān, the Sunnah, Ijmā', and the intellect. They exceeded the bounds in their reliance upon ijmā', so much so that they almost used it as proof in every matter; fundamental or subsidiary. The latter day scholars counted the word ijmā' amongst these sources as well. However, they did not pay attention to it. In fact, they would not rely upon it except if it was paired with another proof on an acceptable matter.¹

The above should not be taken to be a general statement, as there are some latter day scholars who also accept ijmā' as an independent proof.² Nevertheless, their

1 Mughniyah: *Uṣūl al-Fiqh li al-Shrāh al-Imāmiyyah Bayn al-Qadīm wa al-Ḥadīth* (this appeared as an article in the magazine *Risālat al-Islām* (year two, edition 3) page 284-286).

2 Their scholar, al-Sha'rānī (who was given the title 'the well-versed scholar' by them) believes that ijmā' does serve as an independent proof. Al-Sha'rānī: *Ta'ālīq 'Ilmiyyah 'alā Sharḥ al-Jāmi' li al-Māzindarānī* 2/414. Hence, the statement of Mughniyah cannot be accepted. However, I understand this to be another difference of opinion between the Uṣūlīs and Akhbārīs. We find al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī, who belongs to the Akhbārīs, stating:

كل ما هو مذكور في هذا البحث في كتب الأصول فهو من العامة لا دليل عليه، ولا وجه له أصلاً

Whatever is stated under this discussion in the books of principles is taken from the masses (Ahl al-Sunnah). There is no proof for it, and there is absolutely no explanation to it. *Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah* pg. 214.

On the other hand, the Uṣūlīs have researched this 'principle' and have established it in their books regarding the principles of jurisprudence, even though their belief in Imāmah does not allow them to do so. Al-Sha'rānī, one of their contemporary scholars writes in support of ijmā':

روى الطبرسي في الاحتجاج عن أبي الحسن علي بن محمد العسكري في حديث طويل قال: اجتمعت الأمة قاطبة لا اختلاف بينهم في ذلك على أن القرآن حق لا ريب فيه عند جميع فرقها، فهم في حالة الاجتماع عليه مصيبون، وعلى تصديق ما أنزل الله مهتدون؛ لقول النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم: لا تجتمع أمتي على الضلالة... قال الشعرائي: وهو يدل على حجية الإجماع، وكونه دليلاً مستقلاً، وإمكان العلم به، وتصديق لصحة الحديث المشهور "لا تجتمع أمتي على ضلالة

Al-Ṭabarsī reports in *al-Iḥtijāj* from Abu al-Ḥasan 'Ali ibn Muḥammad al-'Askarī, in a lengthy narration, "The ummah is unanimous, with no difference between them that the Qur'ān is the truth. There is nothing doubtful in it according to all its sects. Thus by uniting upon this, they are correct and by believing in that which Allah revealed, they are guided, as Nabī ﷺ said, "My ummah will not unite upon deviation." This proves that ijmā' is an independent proof. It is thus possible to have knowledge of it. It is a verification of the famous ḥadīth, "My ummah will not unite upon deviation." Al-Sha'rānī: *Ta'ālīq 'Ilmiyyah* 2/414

Imām has not been around since the third century. Thus, how should his opinion, which will reveal the status of *ijmāʿ*, be known? Their scholar, al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī, as well as others from the Akhbārīs who followed his footsteps were of the opinion that it is impossible to learn of his opinion in his absence. Therefore, *ijmāʿ* can never be established, as one will never know whether he is amongst them. He cannot be traced since he went into hiding, so it is unknown whether he is in the sea or the land, the east or the west.¹ The Uṣūlīs are adamant that *ijmāʿ* is established and his view may be learnt.

Al-Hamdānī (one of their scholars) states in *Miṣbāḥ al-Faqīh*:

إن المدار على حجية الإجماع على ما استقر عليه رأي المتأخرين ليس على اتفاق الكل، بل ولا على اتفاقهم في عصر واحد، بل على استكشاف رأي المعصوم بطريق الحدس من فتوى علماء الشيعة الحافظين للشريعة، وهذا مما يختلف باختلاف الموارد، فرب مسألة لا يحصل فيها الجزم بموافقة الإمام، وإن اتفقت فيها آراء جميع الأعلام.. ورب مسألة يحصل فيها الجزم بالموافقة ولو من الشهرة

The basis of taking *ijmāʿ* as a proof, as far as the view which is accepted by the latter day scholars, is that it neither has to be the agreement of everyone nor the agreement of all of them in one era. Rather it is based upon unveiling the view of the infallible. This is done by guessing² his view from the verdicts of the scholars of the shīʿah who have encompassed the sharīʿah. However, this could change on different occasions. In some matters, the agreement of the Imām cannot be ascertained, even if all of the luminaries agree, whilst there can be certainty of his agreement in other matters, merely by them being popular.³

We learn from the above text that they figure out the view of their Imām through conjecture. Thus, guessing the view of the Imām, according to them,

1 Al-Ḥāʾirī: *Muqtabas al-Athar* pg. 63

2 The Arabic word Ḥadas literally means the act of guessing. However, here they could be using the philosophical term which means refers to the very first thought that comes up in the mind when thinking about a particular subject. It is similar to the first glance or inspiration. Refer to *Mukhtār al-Ṣiḥāḥ* and *al-Muʿjam al-Falsafī* for further details.

3 *Miṣbāḥ al-Faqīh* pg. 436, *al-Ijtihād wa al-Taqlīd* pg. 17

takes precedence over the unanimity of the pious predecessors. These are the most illogical contradictions. They cannot be sure that a certain view is held by the Imām, even if all the scholars are unanimous upon it, yet they are sure that another view is upheld by the Imām simply because it is the popular view! These are principles which, on the one hand do not make any sense, but at the same time they are confessions that all of their scholars can unanimously opt for misguidance.

Although they have rejected the true meaning of *ijmā'*, they establish that the view of an unknown group is to be accepted and the view of those who are known should be rejected. This is the result of their love for adopting that which is abnormal. Their explanation of this is that the Imām is among the unknown. The author of *Ma'ālim al-Dīn* says:

إذا اختلفت الإمامية على قولين، فإن كانت إحدى الطائفتين معلومة النسب ولم يكن الإمام أحدهم كان الحق مع الطائفة الأخرى، وإن لم تكن معلومة النسب..

When the Imāmiyyah have two different opinions; if the lineage of one of the two groups are known and the Imām is not one of them, the truth will be with the other group, even if their lineage is not known.¹

They go to the extent that they stipulate the presence of an unknown group as a condition for *ijmā'* to take place in the absence of the Imām. They state:

الحق امتناع الاطلاع عادة على حصول الإجماع في زماننا هذا وما ضاهاه من غير جهة النقل، إذ لا سبيل إلى العلم بقول الإمام، كيف وهو موقوف على وجود المجتهدين المجهولين ليدخل في جملتهم ويكون قوله رضي الله عنه مستوراً بين أقوالهم، وهذا مقطوع بانتفائه، فكل إجماع يدعى في كلام الأصحاب مما يقرب من عصر الشيخ إلى زماننا، وليس مستنداً إلى نقل متواتر وآحاد حيث يعتبر أو مع القرائن المفيدة للعلم، فلا بد أن يراد به ما ذكره الشهيد من الشهرة

The truth is that it is generally impossible for *ijmā'* or its likes to take place in this era of ours, without divine texts; as there is no way that the view

1 *Ma'ālim al-Dīn* pg. 406

of the Imām can be known. How can it take place when it is dependent upon the existence of unknown mujtahids (so that he could be amongst them and his view hidden between theirs). This has definitely come to an end. Thus, wherever in the speech of our scholars, from the eras close to the Shaykh until our era, *ijmāʿ* — which is not accompanied by reliable narrations (mutawātir or acceptable *aḥād*) or indications which carry weight — is claimed, it is undoubtedly a reference to the popularity mentioned by al-Shahīd.¹

The most reliable view, according to them, is the view of the unknown group, who are almost non-existent. Since the era of Shaykh al-Ṭāʾifah al-Ṭūsī, they could not be found. The only *ijmāʿ* that presently exists is al-*Ijmāʿ al-Manqūl*.² Perhaps this *ijmāʿ* did exist (according to them) prior to the era of al-Ṭūsī. How paradoxical it is, that the same group who disregards the *ijmāʿ* of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنه searches for the view of unknown people and then practices upon it! The choice of disregarding the view of their scholars, despite their unanimity upon

1 *Maʿālim al-Dīn* pg. 406

2 According to the Imāmiyyah, *ijmāʿ* is of two types:

1. Al-*Ijmāʿ al-Muḥaṣṣal* – this is the *ijmāʿ* that a faqīh finds by going through the verdicts of those who were ‘eligible’ to pass verdicts.
2. Al-*Ijmāʿ al-Manqūl* – this *ijmāʿ* is not found by the faqīh himself. Rather, it is conveyed to him by another faqīh who found it. There could be one person or many people between him and the one who conveyed it to him. Further, it could be narrated by many people, which would make it equivalent to mutawātir. In this case, it is no less than al-Muḥaṣṣal, as far as being a proof is concerned. It could also be reported to the extent of an *aḥād* narration. When the Uṣūlīs refer to al-*Ijmāʿ al-Manqūl*, they generally refer to the second one. There is a difference of opinion amongst them as far as it being a proof is concerned. Al-Muẓaffar: *Uṣūl al-Fiqh* 3/101

Al-Aʿlamī says in *Maqtabas al-Athar* that word *ijmāʿ* is used in a few different ways, according to the terminology of the fuqahā (of the Jaʿfariyyah). One of them is the normal *ijmāʿ*, which means that certainty is reached regarding the view of the Imām. A second usage is al-*Ijmāʿ al-Muḥaṣṣal*. Regarding this, he comments, ‘It is non-existent.’ A third usage is al-*Ijmāʿ al-Manqūl* which is reported on the level of *aḥād* narrations. He comments regarding this type saying, “This is accepted”. *Maqtabas al-Athar* 3/62

something is indeed commendable. However, their rejection of the *ijmāʿ* of the Ṣaḥābah and the pious predecessors is nothing less than disastrous.

Then, in their application of what they refer to as *ijmāʿ*, they once again committed very serious blunders. Hence, the contradictions here turned out to be no less than the contradictions in their narrations. You will realise this by reading their books like *Al-Istibṣār*, *al-Biḥār* and others. Even the view of one specific scholar regarding *ijmāʿ* is not without contradiction. For example, they state regarding Ibn Bābāwayh al-Qummī, the author of *Man Lā Yaḥdūrhī al-Faqīh* – one of the four foundational books of their religion:

إنه ليدعي الإجماع في مسألة ويدعي إجماعاً آخر على خلافها وهو كثير

He claims that *ijmāʿ* took place regarding a certain matter and thereafter claims that another *ijmāʿ* (contrary to this one) took place. He does this often.¹

The author of *Jāmiʿ al-Maḳāl* says:

ومن هذه طريقته في دعوى الإجماع كيف يتم الاعتماد عليه والوثوق بنقله

How can one who chooses this manner in claiming *ijmāʿ* be relied upon, and how can his quotations be accepted?²

They sometimes go to the extent of claiming *ijmāʿ* upon a certain view, which is in fact not upheld by anyone. Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī says:

ربما يدعي الشيخ والسيد إجماع الإمامية على أمر وإن لم يظهر له قائل

At times al-Shaykh and al-Sayyid claim *ijmāʿ* of the Imāmiyyah on a certain matter, whereas apparently, no person holds that view.³

1 Al-Ṭarīḥī: *Jāmiʿ al-Maḳāl fī mā Yatʿallaq bī Aḥwāl al-Ḥadīth wa al-Rijāl* pg. 15

2 ibid

3 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* pg. 34

Al-Ṭabarsī admitted that there are contradictions in their *ijmāʿ*. He emphasises this in the following statement:

الإجماعات المتعارضة من شخص واحد ومن معاصرين أو متقاربي العصر، ورجوع المدعي عن الفتوى التي ادعى الإجماع فيها في ودعوى الإجماع في مسائل غير معنونة في كلام من تقدم على المدعي، وفي مسائل قد اشتهر خلافها بعد المدعي، بل في زمانه، بل ما قبله

(There exists) contrary *ijmāʿāt* (plural of *ijmāʿ*) from one person, two contemporaries and those whose eras were close to one-another. Sometimes a claimant retracts a verdict regarding which he previously claimed *ijmāʿ*. At times *ijmāʿ* is claimed regarding matters which are not specific in the speech of the one who preceded the claimant, and in matters in which the opposite became popular after his era, in his era or even before his era.¹

This is the statement of al-Ṭabarsī, who is a well-versed researcher of their books. He was forced to expose them on this issue, in order to prove his stance, on account of which he authored *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*. He rejected the existence of *ijmāʿ* (amongst them) on account of its contradictions. Whilst his motive behind explaining this was completely incorrect, we have nonetheless benefited as he exposed to us their contradictions as far as defining and applying the concept of *ijmāʿ* is concerned.

Additionally, despite their claim that *ijmāʿ* is that which reveals the view of the infallible one, they do not apply this. Rather, they search for the unanimity of their scholars instead of the view of the infallible one. Thus, one of their scholars (whilst explaining that the view of the infallible one is the truth and not the independent unanimity of the scholars) laments:

والعجب من غفلة الأصحاب عن هذا الأصل وتساهلهم في دعوى الإجماع عند احتجاجهم به للمسائل الفقهية، حتى جعلوه عبارة عن مجرد اتفاق الجماعة من الأصحاب فعدلوا به عن معناه الذي جرى عليه الاصطلاح من غير قرينة جلية، ولا دليل على الحجية معتداً به

1 ibid

It is surprising that the scholars are negligent towards this principle and they unscrupulously claim *ijmāʿ* when trying to prove matters of jurisprudence by means of it. This is to the extent that they use it to refer to the mere unanimity of a group of scholars. Thus, they have turned it away from the meaning which was stipulated for it without any strong indication and without any reliable proof that it is fit to be used as evidence.¹

On the one hand, they do not accept *ijmāʿ* in its true sense. On the other hand, they accept that it is one of the sources of *sharīʿah* (law). Thereafter, they go on to contradict themselves time after time as far as its existence and application is concerned. These contradictions reveal to us the false nature of their claims. To give you a clearer understanding of the difference between the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah on *ijmāʿ*, and their stance, understand the following; if Muḥammad al-Jawwād, who they believe assumed Imāmah at the age of five, held a view at this age of his, or if some Rawāfiḍ attributed a view to him regarding the *sharīʿah*, and the rest of the ummah holds the opposite view, his view will be accepted as the truth!²

Also, if anything is attributed to their awaited one, whose existence is rejected by history – which will be discussed, even through the medium of pieces of paper, and the rest of the ummah opposes him, his view will be taken. Preference is given to the one who does not exist, and the view of the entire ummah is totally disregarded. Al-Mufīd explains this:

فلو قال قولاً لم يوافقته عليه أحد من الأنام لكان كافياً في الحجة والبرهان

If he says anything, but none else from the human race agrees with him, it is sufficient a proof and evidence.³

1 *Maʿālim al-Dīn* pg. 405-406

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* states that the Imāmah of an Imām can be established even if he is three years old. Refer to *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* (Bāb al-Ishārah wa al-Naṣṣ ‘alā Abī Jaʿfar al-Thānī) 1/321. *Al-Irshād* (by al-Mufīd-pg. 298) and *Aʿlām al-Warā* (by al-Ṭabarsī pg. 331) state that he may even be less than three years of age. Refer to *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/102-103 as well.

3 *Awāʿil al-Maḳālāt* pg. 100

Does this need any scrutiny? Al-Mufīd boasts that this is a view held only by his sect. He says:

وهذا مذهب أهل الإمامة خاصة، ويخالفهم فيه المعتزلة والمرجئة والخوارج وأصحاب الحديث..

This is the view of the Imāmiyyah only. They are opposed in it by the Mu‘tazilah, Murji’ah, Khawārij, scholars of ḥadīth...¹

2. Guidance Lies in Opposing the Masses (Ahl al-Sunnah)

Ijmā‘, according to all Muslims is the view which is agreed upon by the ummah, as the ummah cannot unite upon falsehood. Allah ﷻ says:

وَمَنْ يُشَاقِقِ الرَّسُولَ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا تَبَيَّنَ لَهُ الْهُدَىٰ وَيَتَّبِعْ غَيْرَ سَبِيلِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ نُوَلِّهِ مَا تَوَلَّىٰ وَنُصْلِهِ جَهَنَّمَ ۖ وَسَاءَتْ مَصِيرًا

And whoever opposes the Messenger after guidance has become clear to him and follows other than the way of the believers – We will give him what he has taken and drive him into Hell, and evil it is as a destination.²

Nabī ﷺ said:

1 ibid

2 Sūrah al-Nisā: 115. Thus, whoever opposes the ijmā‘ of the ummah has chosen a path other than that of the Muslims. Refer to *Majmū‘ Fatāwā* 19/194. It is on account of this verse that al-Imām al-Shāfi‘ī declared it forbidden to oppose the ijmā‘ of the ummah. He arrived at this conclusion after a great deal of thinking and contemplation. It is undoubtedly one of the best and most accurate deductions. Some have objected to it and thus opined that it (the verse) should not be used as proof. *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 1/590. Ibn Taymiyyah wrote an excellent piece regarding this verse and ijmā‘. Refer to *Majmū‘ Fatāwā* 19/178, 179, 192. Also refer to *Tafsīr al-Qāsimī* 5/459. Ibn Kathīr says, “The phrase ‘...and follows other than the way of the believers’ is attached to the first part. Sometimes opposition is of the texts of shari‘ah and sometimes it is of the consensus of the ummah of Muḥammad ﷺ which is known without doubt. Their consensus is a guarantee against error. This is an honour that they have been blessed with and glorification of their Nabī ﷺ. There are many authentic aḥādīth regarding this. Some scholars have stated that the meaning is mutawātir. *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 1/590

لا تزال طائفة من أمتي قائمة بأمر الله لا يضرهم من خذلهم أو خالفهم حتى يأتي أمر الله وهو ظاهرون
على الناس

A group from my ummah will always be steadfast upon the command of Allah. Those who desert them or oppose them will not harm them, until the matter of Allah comes, whilst they are dominant over the people.¹

Rasūlullāh ﷺ also said (which is reported in many narrations):

لا تجتمع أمتي على ضلالة

My Ummah will never unite upon misguidance.²

This refers to the unanimity of the Muslims. As for the Shī'ah, they search for the *ijmā'* of the Imām instead of the entire ummah. The deciding factor, according to them, is whether or not the view is from people who accept the Twelve Imāms. The Imām either has to be amongst them or their view should reveal the view of the Imām, as explained previously. There is no consideration given to the scholars of the ummah of Muḥammad ﷺ.

It does not end there. They go a step further by stating that guidance lies in opposing the *ijmā'* of the Muslims. Opposition of the Muslims is one of their principles as far as deciding between two opinions is concerned. It has become one of the foundations of their *madh-hab*. They have many texts which emphasise this 'principle' and encourage it. *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* records the following conversation with one of the Imāms:

إذا وجدنا أحد الخبرين موافقاً للعامة والآخر مخالفاً لهم بأي الخبرين يؤخذ؟ فقال: ما خالف العامة ففيه
الرشاد، فقلت (القائل هو الراوي): جعلت فداك، فإن وافقها الخبران جميعاً؟ قال: ينظر إلى ما هم إليه

1 *Muslim Kitāb al-Jihād* 2/1524. Al-Bukhārī narrates a ḥadīth of the same meaning in *Kitāb al-I'tisām bī al-Kitāb wa al-Sunnah* 8/149

2 Al-Sakhāwī says, "(This is a) famous text, reported with many isnāds and corroborations both from the aḥādīth of Nabī ﷺ as well as the sayings of those after him." *Al-Maqāṣid al-Hasanah* pg. 460

أميل حكاهم وقضاتها فيترك ويؤخذ بالآخر، قلت: فإن وافق حكاهم الخبرين جميعاً؟ قال: إذا كان ذلك
فارجئه حتى تلقى إمامك، فإن الوقوف عند الشبهات خير من الاقتحام في الهلكات

“If we find one narration corresponding to the masses and the other
opposing them, which of the two should we take.”

He replied, “Guidance lies in that which opposes the masses.”

I (the narrator) asked, “May I be sacrificed for you, what if both conforms
to them?”

He replied, “Find the one towards which their judges and rulers are more
inclined towards. This one will be left and the other one will be taken.”

I asked, “If their judges are inclined towards both?”

He said, ‘If that is the case, then delay the matter until you meet your
Imām. It is better to stay away from the doubtful matters than to plummet
into something destructive.”¹

Their ‘reliable scholar’, al-Kulaynī mentions that one of the manners in which
a decision can be reached when the narrations are contradictory is as stated by
the Imām:

دعوا ما وافق القوم فإن الرشد في خلافهم

Leave that which corresponds to (the view of) the nation, as guidance lies
in opposing them.²

Abū ‘Abd Allah says (according to their fabrications):

1 Al-Kulaynī: *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/67-68, Ibn Bābāwayh al-Qummī: *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* 3/5, al-Ṭūsī: *Al-Tahdhīb* 6/301, al-Ṭabarsī: *al-Iḥtijāj* pg. 194, al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī: *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 18/75-76

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* pg. 8 (introduction), *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 18/80

إذا ورد عليكم حديثان مختلفان فخذوا بما يخالف القوم

If there are two contradictory narrations before you, then take the one that opposes the people.¹

Ḥasan ibn Jahm reports:

قلت للعبد الصالح - رضي الله عنه - "هل يسعنا فيما ورد علينا منكم إلا التسليم لكم؟ فقال: لا والله لا يسعكم إلا التسليم لنا، فقلت: فيروى عن أبي عبد الله شيء، ويروى عنه خلافه فأيهما نأخذ؟ فقال: خذ بما خالف القوم وما وافق القوم فاجتنبه

I asked the pious slave (i.e. the Imām), "Do we have any choice regarding those matters which have reached us from you besides submitting to your decisions?"

He replied, "No, by the oath of Allah you have no choice but to submit to our decisions."

I asked, "How about the case when something is reported from Abū 'Abd Allah and the opposite is also reported from him, which one do we take?"

He answered, "Take that which opposes the people, and stay away from whatever conforms to their (view)."²

They explain that the rationale behind this principle is that which Abū Baṣīr attributes to Abū 'Abd Allah:

ما أنتم والله على شيء مما هم فيه، ولا هم على شيء مما أنتم فيه، فخالقوهم فما هم من الحنيفية على شيء

By the oath of Allah, you and they have absolutely nothing in common. Oppose them, as they have no portion of the true religion.³

1 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 18/85

2 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 18/85

3 *ibid*

The heretics, who thrive upon creating division in the ummah, have duped the ignorant ones (who divorced their intellectual abilities after filling their souls with that which they refer to as ‘sacrifices for the Ahl al-Bayt’, and intoxicating themselves with the unrealistic rewards promised to them for nothing other than ‘love for the Ahl al-Bayt’). They said to them:

إن الأصل في هذا المبدأ أن علياً - رضي الله عنه - لم يكن يدين الله بدين إلا خالف عليه الأمة إلى غيره
إرادة لإبطال أمره، وكانوا يسألون أمير المؤمنين عن الشيء الذي لا يعلمونه، فإذا أفاتهم جعلوا له من
عندهم ليتبسوا على الناس

The basis of this principle is that ‘Alī عليه السلام would not worship Allah in any manner, except that the ummah would oppose him and do something else. They did this in order to destroy his matter. They would ask Amīr al-Mu’minīn regarding that which they did not know. When he would give them a verdict, they would attribute something else to him from their own side to confuse the people.¹

They contradict themselves yet again. They claim that ‘Umar عليه السلام would seek his counsel in every matter, minor or major. He would then accept it and practise upon it. They further claim that the Ṣaḥābah would consult him regarding all their difficult matters.² ‘Umar عليه السلام is reported to have said (according to their narrations), “May I not live in ummah for whom you are not there for, o Abū al-Ḥasan. May I not live to encounter a difficulty if Abū al-Ḥasan is not there to solve it.”³

Now, which of the two claims should we believe? These fabricators have no limit to contradicting themselves, as is usual with liars. Hereunder is another guideline to ensure that their followers can never bridge the gap between themselves and the Muslims. ‘Alī ibn Asbāt reports:

1 Ibn Bābāwayh: ‘Ilal al-Sharā’i’ pg. 531, Wasā’il al-Shī’ah 18/83

2 Refer to Minhāj al-Sunnah, where he quotes the speech of Ibn al-Muṭaḥhar regarding this. 4/160

3 Manāqib Āl Abī Ṭālib 1/492-493, al-Ṣadiq: ‘Alī wa al-Ḥākimūn pg. 120

قلت للرضا - رضي الله عنه -: يحدث الأمر لا أجد بداً من معرفته، وليس في البلد الذي أنا فيه أحد أستفتيه من مواليك، قال: انت فقيه البلد، فاستفتته عن أمرك، فإذا أفتاك بشيء فخذ بخلافه، فإن الحق فيه

I said to al-Riḍā رحمته الله, “A matter surfaces, which I am forced to learn about. However, in the place in which I am, there are none of your supporters, from whom I may find out.”

He replied, “Approach the jurist of the area and ask him regarding your matter. When he passes a verdict for you, do the opposite of that, as the truth lies therein.”¹

One of their scholars comments on this narration saying:

من جملة نعماء الله على هذه الطائفة المحقة أنه خلى بين الشيطان وبين علماء العامة، فأضلهم في جميع المسائل النظرية حتى يكون الأخذ بخلافهم ضابطة لنا، ونظيره ما ورد في حق النساء شاوروهن وخالفوهن

Among the greatest bounties of Allah upon this true sect is that he cleared the path between the devil and the scholars of the masses. Thus, he misguided them in all academic matters, to the extent that opposing them has become one of our principles. Similar to this is the narration regarding women, “Consult them and oppose them.”²

These texts are capable of causing colossal damage, and there is no doubt that they are from the fabrications of a heretic who wished to destroy Islam as well as the Muslim ummah. He attempted to open a huge door from which people can exit the fold of Islam, as they will rush towards opposing the Muslim ummah in every religious matter. When this is the case, then how can it make any sense that the same sect calls towards unity? Can there ever be unity if guidance always lies in opposing the Ahl al-Sunnah?

1 Ibn Bābāwayh: *ʿIlal al-Sharāʿi* pg. 531, al-Ṭūsī: *Al-Tahdhīb* 6/295, *Wasāʾil al-Shīʿah* 18/82-83, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 2/233

2 Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: *al-Īqāz min al-Hajʾah* pg. 70-71

Analysing this View

Added to the indications made by us whilst presenting their view, we wish to elucidate further on the matter. Accepting *ijmāʿ* as a proof has been discussed at length in the books of principles. There it has been proven to be a correct and accurate view in a convincing and a satisfying manner. Thus, we will not delve into it here. As far as the *Shīʿah* are concerned, they accept it by name, but reject its reality.

Their contemporary scholar, al-Mughniyah states that the former scholars of his sect all agreed upon accepting *ijmāʿ*, and the latter day scholars have counted it as one of their proofs, but they have not relied upon it. This means that they have either opposed *ijmāʿ*, which they counted as one of their fundamental proofs, opposed the truth upon which their former scholars agreed upon or the former *Shīʿah* united upon misguidance. The reality is that the sum total of all the opinions is rejection of *ijmāʿ*, even though some of them make extensive claims regarding this, especially in their books on principles. This is because the claim of *ijmāʿ*, after scrutiny, is proven to be a meaningless one, with the purpose being defeated.

Added to that, the confusion amongst them as far as deciding whether or not *ijmāʿ* took place in certain issues is further proof that they are clueless on the issue. The greatest sign, however, is their stipulation (as a condition) that a scholar whose lineage is unknown should be amongst the group so that he could be imagined to be the *Imām*. Ibn Taymiyyah wrote this off as the severest form of ignorance. He says, “I have seen in the books of their scholars that if they have two different opinions regarding a matter; and it is known who held one of the views, but unknown who held the opposing view, they choose the latter as the correct view as they say, “If the man behind the view is unknown, then it must be the view of the *Imām*.” Is this not the worst type of ignorance?

Take a moment to get over this. They believe that their lack of knowledge regarding the person and the authenticity of his view is actually proof that the

view is authentic! Ibn Taymiyyah poses a few pertinent questions; on what basis do they decide that the second view is definitely that of the Imām? Why have they ruled out the possibility that he could have agreed with the other view? What convinces them that the unknown person had any idea on the matter, and was not just a scamp from the humans or jinn? Thus, they have established ignorance on the basis of ignorance, as their only proof of a view being held by the Imām is that they do not know who stated it! This is the end-result of the one who turns away from the light of the sunnah, which Allah revealed upon His Messenger ﷺ. He ends up in the centre of heaps of darkness.¹

Their scholar, al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī (the author of *al-Wasā'il*) refuted their stance² saying:

وقولهم باشتراط دخول مجهول النسب فيهم أعجب وأغرب، وأي دليل دل عليه؟ وكيف يحصل مع ذلك العلم بكونه هو المعصوم أو الظن به

Their condition that a person of unknown lineage should be amongst them is most weird and bizarre. Which proof establishes this? How does that lead them to know, or even think that he is the infallible one?³

There is yet another question that begs to be asked. How is it that they have taken the view of a five year old, who is unable to take care of himself to be equivalent to the consensus of the ummah? In fact, they actually believe that the view upon which the ummah have consensus should be discarded and the view of this child (who does not really exist) should be accepted. This is the peak of misguidance.

Further, if one does some research regarding their *ijmā'* (which only exists by name), which supposedly reveals the view of the Imām, he will find but contradictions. One merely has to browse through the narrations of *Al-Tahdhīb*

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/265-266

2 He belongs to the Akhbārīs, who do not accept *ijmā'* as a proof.

3 *Maqtabas al-Athar* 3/63

and *Al-Istibṣār* to see this. This was even admitted by al-Ṭūsī in the introduction of *Al-Tahdhīb*. According to him, this is one of the reasons why many people are leaving Shī'ism.

The most important matter, according to the Shī'ah is the acceptance of the Imām. However, the different sects among them have disagreed on his appointment. There are strong differences amongst them on this matter, as explained in the books regarding sects written by both the Ahl al-Sunnah as well as the Shī'ah. Thus, how is it possible to have *ijmā'* when the foundation of the religion is being eaten away by differences?

Then, as explained, their claims of *ijmā'* are contradictory. However, their views regarding the matters in which they claim *ijmā'* and oppose the majority are totally ludicrous, whether they are related to the foundation matters or the subsidiary ones. Among these views are; their acceptance of the awaited one, who did not ever exist, their extremism regarding the Imām and his miracles and so on. We will discuss some of these in detail at a later stage. Ibn Taymiyyah says, "The Shī'ah do not have a single view upon which they agree."¹

This is the absolute truth. The Shī'ah themselves admit it. *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* contains the following narration:

عن زرارة بن أعين عن أبي جعفر - رضي الله عنه - قال: سألته عن مسألة فأجابني، ثم جاءه رجل فسأله عنها، فأجابه بخلاف ما أجابني، ثم جاءه رجل آخر فأجابه بخلاف ما أجابني وأجاب صاحبي، فلما خرج الرجلان قلت: يا ابن رسول الله، رجلان من أهل العراق من شيعتكم قدما يسألان فأجبت كل واحد منهما بغير ما أجبت به صاحبه؟ فقال: يا زرارة، إن هذا خير لنا ولكم، ولو اجتمعتم على أمر واحد لصدقكم الناس علينا، ولكن أقل لبقاتنا وبقائكم

Zurārah ibn A'yan reports regarding Abū Ja'far عليه السلام, "I asked him regarding a certain matter so he answered me. Thereafter, another man came to him and asked him regarding it. He gave him an answer contrary to the one

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/129

that he gave me. Then, a third man came and he gave him an answer that was neither like the one he gave me, nor like the one he gave the man after me. When the two men walked out, I asked, “O son of Rasūlullāh, two men from Iraq—**from your Shī‘ah**—came to you and asked you (regarding the same matter), but you gave each one of them a different reply?”

He responded, “O Zurārah, this is better for me and you. If you all hold one opinion, the people will believe that it is your opinion, which will be shorten my and your existence.”¹

This establishes that it is among the core principles of their religion that (on the basis of Taqiyyah) their views should always be contradictory, to ensure (as they claim) that their enemies do not ever realise their actual stance. The truth is, this has resulted in their religion becoming a total mess, as they cannot pinpoint the ‘views of the Imāms’. When this is the case, how will they ascertain the view of the Imām in any matter?

Imām Abū Ja‘far was undoubtedly free from all of their claims. This narration is another fabrication of the heretics, aimed at keeping the Shī‘ah in the dark as far as the views of Imām Abū Ja‘far and the other scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt are concerned. They do this to create space for themselves, so that they can spread their kufr and extremism. Whenever the Imāms exposed them by rejecting these heretical beliefs, they bluffed their public by claiming that the Imām was practising Taqiyyah.

The great scholar of India, who authored *al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah* states, “As for ijmā‘, their claim that it is one of their proofs is baseless. They do not accept it as an independent proof, but rather take it as proof due to their belief that it contains the view of the Imām. Thus, the basis of it is the Imām, not ijmā‘.” They also have differences regarding the infallibility of the Imām, just as they disagree regarding the appointment of some.

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/65

The *ijmā'* of the people of the first era (before the great fitnah took place) holds no weight according to them. The people of the first era were unanimous upon the *khilāfah* of Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān, the fact that the possessions of Nabī ﷺ could not be inherited by anyone, and the impermissibility of Mut'ah. However, each of these views is baseless according to them. When the *ijmā'* of this era is not accepted by them, then how can they accept any *ijmā'* that takes place thereafter (when differences and sectarianism plagued the ummah), especially regarding controversial issues which require sound proofs?

The author of *al-Tuḥfah* then points out some of their contradictions, wherein some claim *ijmā'* regarding a matter but their claims are rejected and belied by others. Their scholar al-Shahīd al-Thānī (who is greatly revered by them) dedicated a special chapter to point out the places in which al-Ṭūsī claimed *ijmā'*, but passed opposing verdicts on other occasions.¹ The author of *al-Tuḥfah* then quotes him verbatim.²

In essence, they 'accept' *ijmā'* because it reveals the view of the Imām, and not because they believe that the ummah cannot unite upon deviation, as believed by the Ahl al-Sunnah. The truth about them is that they reject *ijmā'*, as well as the narration which is established in their books:

لا تجتمع أمتي على ضلالة

My ummah will not unite upon misguidance.³

1 Zayn al-Dīn al-ʿĀmilī (al-Shahīd al-Thānī) gathered forty rulings regarding which al-Ṭūsī claimed *ijmā'* but opposed most of them on other occasions. Some of their scholars go as far as claiming *ijmā'* regarding their personal views. Al-Majlisī explains the cause of this to be that they forgot the principles laid by them after getting involved in the subsidiary matters. Thus, they claimed *ijmā'* in most matters, whether there existed a difference of opinion or not. They did not even take into consideration whether or not there were different narrations. Refer to *al-Shī'ah fī al-Mīzān* pg. 323. Another reason why these contradictions take place is that they copy their verdicts from the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Thus, no consideration was given to the false ideas upheld by them when these verdicts were passed.

2 Refer to *al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* page 118, *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* pg. 51

3 Al-Sha'rānī: *Ta'ālīq 'Ilmiyyah* 2/414

We have already explained that this ḥadīth is established in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah as well. We wish to ask them: Why do they ignore this ḥadīth, which is accepted by both sects? Added to this narration, *al-Iḥtijāj* (one of their authentic books according to al-Majlisī and others) has a lengthy narration from Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-‘Askarī. Part of it reads:

واجتمعت الأمة قاطبة لا اختلاف بينهم في ذلك على أن القرآن حق لا ريب فيه عند جميع فرقها، فهم في حالة الاجتماع عليه مصيبون وعلى تصديق ما أنزل الله مهتدون لقول النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم: “لا تجتمع أمتي على الضلالة” فأخبر أن ما أجمعت عليه الأمة، ولم يخالف بعضها بعضاً هو الحق، فهذا معنى الحديث، لا ما تأوله الجاهلون، ولا ما قاله المعاندون من إبطال حكم الكتاب، واتباع حكم الأحاديث المزورة، والروايات المزخرفة، واتباع الأهواء المردية المهلكة التي تخالف نص الكتاب، وتحقيق الآيات الواضحات النيرات..

The entire ummah has agreed, without any difference between them that the Qur’ān is undoubtedly the truth. There is no doubt regarding this, according to all of its sects. Thus, in their agreement upon this, they are on the right path and by believing in that which Allah revealed, they are guided, as Nabī ﷺ said, “**My ummah will not unite upon misguidance.**” Thus, he explained that whatever the ummah unites upon and do not oppose one-another regarding it, is the truth. This is the meaning of the ḥadīth. It is not as interpreted by the ignorant and stubborn ones, who wish to do away with the commands of the Book of Allah, preferring fabricated and false narrations and destructive lowly desires which contradict the text of the Qur’ān and the reality of the illuminated and clear verses...¹

As you have seen in this narration, their Imām did not say, “Search for that which was agreed upon by the group with whom the Imām was and leave the view of the other group. Search for the group who has a person whose lineage is unknown, as the Imām could be amongst them, or he could be the one whose lineage is unknown.” Instead, he said to them that the truth is in those matters in which they agree and do not oppose one another. He further explained that the basis of finding the truth is the Qur’ān and Sunnah, and that *ijmā‘* is definitely a sign of

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 2/225

the truth as Nabī ﷺ said, “My ummah will not unite upon misguidance.” He even warned them of following false narrations.

So why is it that this sect persists upon being different and taking these false narrations? Why do they discard the view of their Imām and distance themselves from the rest of the ummah, belittling their ijmā‘? Why do they prefer the view of a child, or a non-existent one over the ijmā‘ of the ummah of Islam? Do they do all of this to uphold the fabrication of a heretic, who told them that guidance lies in opposing the majority?

Thus, they took opposition of the Ahl al-Sunnah (who followed the footsteps of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ) to be the basis of salvation. If the Ahl al-Sunnah abstains from something, they grab on to it and if the Ahl al-Sunnah upholds something they discard it. In so doing, they have left the fold of Islam. They are clearly upon misguidance and surely they will gain everything but salvation.¹

Allah سبحانه وتعالى says:

وَمَنْ يُشَاقِقِ الرَّسُولَ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا تَبَيَّنَ لَهُ الْهُدَىٰ وَيَتَّبِعْ غَيْرَ سَبِيلِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ نُوَلِّهِ مَا تَوَلَّىٰ وَنُصْلِهِ
جَهَنَّمَ ۚ وَسَاءَتْ مَصِيرًا

And whoever opposes the Messenger after guidance has become clear to him and follows other than the way of the believers – We will give him what he has taken and drive him into Hell, and evil it is as a destination.²

If this principle — guidance lies in opposing the Ahl al-Sunnah — was from the Imāms (as claimed by this sect), they would have been the first ones to practice upon it. The truth, which the Shī‘ah scholars accept, is that ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would not oppose the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. Al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā explains:

1 Al-Ālūsī: *Kashf Ghayāhib al-Jahālāt* pg. 6

2 Sūrah al-Nisā: 115

دخل في آرائهم، وصلى مقتدياً بهم، وأخذ عطيتهم، ونكح سبيهم، وأنكحهم، ودخل في الشورى

He accepted their opinions, performed ṣalāh behind them, accepted their gifts, married their captives, got them married, and took part in the meetings.¹

He did not ever oppose them in a matter in which they all agreed. He would dislike differences, as reported by al-Bukhārī:

اقضوا كما كنتم تقضون، فإنني أكره الاختلاف حتى يكون الناس جماعة

Pass judgments as you were passing them, so that the people can remain together. I dislike differences.²

Ibn Ḥajar says, “His statement, ‘I dislike differences,’ refers to those differences which create fights. Ibn al-Tīn says, he meant he did not want to oppose Abū Bakr and ‘Umar. Others say that he meant such differences which lead to disputes and strife. This is supported by the other portion of his statement, ‘so that the people can remain together’.”³ The views of the Shī‘ah, in which they oppose the rest of the people, are not in conformity to the guidelines of ‘Alī عليه السلام. He was with the ummah in their ijmā‘, as this was guidance. There is no guidance in opposing them, as claimed by this bigoted group, whose only wish is to disunite the ummah.

This is why we find no answer to ‘Alī’s عليه السلام conformity to the ummah besides Taqiyyah. In other words, they claim that he was behaving like a hypocrite towards the Ṣaḥābah عليهم السلام. Indeed Allah has exonerated him from their lies. This claim, added to it being rejected by the dīn, is a mockery of the intelligence of the masses and it is denied by history. The scholars of the Shī‘ah were unable to find

1 Al-Murtaḍā: *Tanzīh al-Ambiyā*’ pg. 132

2 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī (with *Faṭḥ al-Bārī*) 7/71

3 *Faṭḥ al-Bārī* 7/73

an example of ‘Alī’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ application of this ‘principle’. Instead, as stated by al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (one of their senior scholars), they admit that he would agree with the stances of the ummah.

They cannot even prove his opposition of the ummah from the era in which he was the Khalīfah, in which Taqīyyah is discarded. They cannot deny that at this juncture too, he agreed with the views of the ummah. Their scholar, Ni‘mat Allah al-Jazā’iri says:

ولما جلس أمير المؤمنين - عليه السلام - على سرير الخلافة لم يتمكن من إظهار ذلك القرآن وإخفاء هذا؛ لما فيه من إظهار الشنعة على من سبقه، كما لم يقدر على النهي عن صلاة الضحى، وكما لم يقدر على إجراء المتعتين متعة الحج ومتعة النساء.. وكما لم يقدر على عزل شريح عن القضاء، ومعاوية عن الإمارة

When Amīr al-Mu‘minīn sat upon the pedestal of khilāfah, he was unable to present that Qur’ān and hide this one, as it would entail showing a dislike for those who preceded him. Similarly, he was unable to prevent (people) from the ṣalāh of the mid-morning, just as he was unable to implement the two Mut’āhs; the Mut’ah of Ḥajj and the Mut’ah of women. He also could not remove Shurayḥ from the post of being a judge or Mu‘āwīyah from the post of leadership.¹

As you have seen, the Ahl al-Sunnah as well as the Shī‘ah, both agree that Amīr al-Mu‘minīn did not go against the ijāmā‘ of the ummah. The Imāmiyyah have thus opposed him when they laid for themselves the principle of opposing the ummah. Thus, neither are they his Shī‘ah (supporters or followers), nor is he their Imām.

1 Al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah 2/362

Section Two

This section contains four chapters:

1. Their belief regarding the Oneness of Allah as the *Ilāh* (deity).
2. Their belief regarding the Oneness of Allah as the *Rabb* (nourisher).
3. Their belief regarding the attributes and qualities of Allah.
4. Their belief regarding *Īmān* and its fundamentals.

Chapter One

Their Belief Regarding the Oneness of Allah as the *Ilāh*.

The meaning of the Oneness of Allah in terms of him being the *Ilāh* is that Allah should be worshipped exclusively, as He is the only one who deserves to be worshipped. Allah has no partners. Acts of worship should be dedicated entirely to Him. No act of worship should be directed, in any way or form, to anyone other than Him.¹ This is the oneness toward which the *Ambiyā'* invited, for the Oneness of Allah in terms of him being the *Rabb* was already acknowledged by their people as Allah informs us in the Qur'an regarding the invitations of His Messengers: *Nūḥ*, *Hūd*, *Ṣāliḥ* and *Shu'ayb* عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام to their people:

اعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ مَا لَكُمْ مِنْ إِلَهٍ غَيْرُهُ

Worship Allah; you have no deity other than Him.²

Allah informed us that this was the message of all the Messengers. He says:

وَلَقَدْ بَعَثْنَا فِي كُلِّ أُمَّةٍ رَسُولًا أَنِ اعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ وَاجْتَنِبُوا الطَّاغُوتَ

And we certainly sent a Messenger to every nation, [saying], "Worship Allah and avoid the *Tāghūt*."³

1 *Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwīyyah* pg. 16; *Lawāmi' al-Anwār* 1/29; *Taysīr al-'Azīz al-Ḥamīd* pg. 36

2 *Sūrah al-A'rāf*: 59, 65, 73, 85

3 *Sūrah al-Naḥl*: 36

Elsewhere, Allah says:

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ قَبْلِكَ مِنْ رَّسُولٍ إِلَّا نُوحِي إِلَيْهِ أَنَّهُ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا أَنَا فَاعْبُدُونِ

And we have not sent before you any Messenger except that we revealed to him, “There is no deity except Me, so worship Me.”¹

This is the foundation of success and the fundamental requirement for the acceptance of worship. Allah says:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَغْفِرُ أَنْ يُشْرَكَ بِهِ وَيَغْفِرُ مَا دُونَ ذَلِكَ لِمَنْ يَشَاءُ

Indeed, Allah does not forgive that a partner be ascribed to him, and forgives whomsoever he wills for any wrong besides that.²

Do the Shī'ah uphold this fundamental principle and foundational pillar? Or, did their beliefs regarding the Imāms impact the belief in the Oneness of Allah? This is what we will analyse below. I shall present the following seven discussions regarding the topic, Allah willing:

1. Their belief regarding verses which discuss the Oneness of Allah in terms of Allah being the only One worthy of worship; the integral most principle of Dīn (faith) and in which many nations have deviated. Their belief that the motive behind these verses is the establishment of the immediate succession of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ after the Rasūl صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ without anyone sharing that privilege with him.
2. Their belief that the acceptance of all devotions is based upon believing in the Twelve Imāms and their Imāmah instead of the Oneness of Allah.
3. Their belief that the Imāms are intermediaries between Allah and His creation, to the extent that they deify them and supplicate to them in prosperous and adverse times.

1 Sūrah al-Ambiyā': 25

2 Sūrah al-Nisā: 48, 116

4. Their belief that the Imāms have the right of legislation, declaring the impermissible permissible and vice versa.
5. Their belief that the sand of the grave of Ḥusayn عليه السلام is a cure for all illnesses, and a protection from all fears.
6. Their usage of charms and esoteric symbols to alleviate difficulties and chronic conditions, and their seeking of help for guidance from unknown entities.
7. Their seeking of goodness in matters that resemble the practices of Jāhiliyyah (pre-Islam).¹

1 The last four points can also be included in *Tawḥīd al-Rubūbiyyah*. There is no doubt that the two are inter-twined.

Discussion One

Interpreting the Verses of Tawhīd to be a Reference to the Imāms

The first aspect that sends shivers down our spines is that they have re-interpreted all the Qur'ānic verses in which the instruction to worship Allah alone is issued to refer to the Imāmah of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the Imāms after him. As for the verses regarding *shirk* (polytheism), they take the purport of these to be ascribing partners to the Imāms.

a. First verse

As an example, *al-Kāfī*¹ (the most authentic book of narrations according to them), *Tafsīr al-Qummī*² (their best tafsīr) as well as other books which they consider reliable³ under the commentary of the verse:

وَلَقَدْ أُوحِيَ إِلَيْكَ وَإِلَى الَّذِينَ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ لَئِنْ أَشْرَكْتَ لَيَحْبَطَنَّ عَمَلُكَ

And it has been revealed to you and to those before you that if you should associate [anything] with Allah, your devotions would surely become worthless, and you would surely be among the losers.⁴

They state:

يعني إن أشركت في الولاية غيره

This means that if you associate any partners with him in Wilāyah (immediate succession and leadership).⁵

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/427, number 76

2 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/251

3 *Al-Burhān* 4/83, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfī* 4/328

4 *Sūrah al-Zumar*: 65

5 These are the words of al-Kulaynī in *al-Kāfī*

In other words:

لئن أمرت بولاية أحد مع ولاية علي من بعدك ليحبطن عملك

If you (O Muḥammad ﷺ) command that anyone be granted Wilāyah along with ‘Alī, after you, your devotions will become worthless.¹

The author of *al-Burhān fī Tafsīr al-Qur’ān* has quoted four narrations to prove the above interpretation of the verse.² Regarding the revelation of this verse, they say:

إن الله عز وجل حيث أوحى إلى نبيه صلى الله عليه وسلم أن يقيم عليًا للناس علمًا اندس إليه معاذ بن جبل فقال أشرك في ولايته الأول والثاني (يعنون أبا بكر وعمر) حتى يسكن الناس إلى قولك ويصدقوك، فلما أنزل الله عز وجل يَا أَيُّهَا الرُّسُولُ بَلِّغْ مَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكَ مِنْ رَبِّكَ شَكَرَ رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلى جبرائيل فقال إن الناس يكذبوني ولا يقبلون مني، فأنزل الله عز وجل لئن أشركت ليحبطن عملك وَلَتَكُونَنَّ مِنَ الْخَاسِرِينَ

When Allah revealed to his Nabī ﷺ that he should establish ‘Alī as a symbol of direction for the people, Mu’adh ibn Jabal sneaked in and said, “Add to his Wilāyah the first and the second (i.e. Abū Bakr and ‘Umar), so that the people be contented with your verdict and they believe you.”

When Allah revealed, “O Messenger, convey that which has been revealed to you from your Lord.”³ Rasūlullāh ﷺ complained to Jibrīl, “People are belying me and they do not want to accept from me.” Thereupon, Allah revealed, “If you associate a partner, your actions will certainly become worthless, and you will surely be among the losers.”⁴

We will now quote the verse that precedes this verse as well as the verse which follows it, along with the correct exegesis so that the reader realises the extent to

1 These are the words of al-Qummī in his tafsīr.

2 *Al-Burhān* 4/83

3 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 67

4 *Al-Burhān* 4/83

which they have gone in corrupting the dīn and in changing its most fundamental principle. Allah says:

قُلْ أَفَغَيْرَ اللَّهِ تَأْمُرُونِي أَعْبُدُ أَيُّهَا الْجَاهِلُونَ وَلَقَدْ أُوحِيَ إِلَيْكَ وَإِلَى الَّذِينَ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ لَئِنْ أَشْرَكْتَ
لَيَحْبَطَنَّ عَمَلُكَ وَلَتَكُونَنَّ مِنَ الْخَاسِرِينَ بَلِ اللَّهُ فَاعْبُدْ وَكُنْ مِنَ الشَّاكِرِينَ

Say (O Muḥammad), “Is it other than Allah that you order me to worship, O ignorant ones?” And it has been revealed to you and to those before you that if you associate (anything) with Allah, your actions will become worthless, and you will surely be among the losers. Worship Allah alone instead, and be among the grateful.¹

The verse, as is apparent from its context, is concerning the command of dedicating acts of worship to Allah alone. They have changed the verse, and linked it to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه whereas there is absolutely no reference to him. They have interpreted the word “Allah” to mean ‘Alī, and the word “worship” to mean Wilāyah. The verse is quite clear and its purport is equally unambiguous. There is no link between the meaning of the verse and their interpretation thereof.

The scholars have explained this verse in the following manner:

Allah commanded His Nabī صلی الله علیه وسلم to say this to the polytheists when they invited him to the worship of idols. They said to him, “It is the religion of your forefathers.”² The meaning of this verse is, “Say O Muḥammad, to the polytheists among your people, ‘Are you commanding me to worship anyone other than Allah, O those who are ignorant regarding him?’” Since the instruction of worshipping anyone besides Allah can only be issued by a foolish ignoramus, He addressed them as “O ignorant ones”. Thereafter, Allah explained that the warning, “If you associate (partners with Allah) your work will become worthless.” was revealed to Nabī صلی الله علیه وسلم as well as the messengers who preceded him. This was to highlight the gravity and

1 Sūrah al-Zumar: 64-66

2 Ibn Kathīr narrated from some of the salaf that this was the reason behind its revelation. Refer to *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 4/67, *Tafsīr al-Baghawī* 4/284.

heinousness of shirk. The one who would never have done it was being commanded to abstain from it, hence anyone besides him should be even more wary. Thereafter, Allah says, “Worship Allah only instead”, i.e. do not worship that which the polytheists are instructing you to worship but worship Allah alone, leaving out all other deities and idols.¹

Thus, as you have seen, the meaning is quite clear and obvious. Only a prejudiced follower of his desires (who is blinded from discerning the truth) will accept another interpretation. The ultimate goal of those who fabricated this interpretation was to forge for themselves some sort of proof to back their claims regarding Imāmah. Unsurprisingly, they stooped to the lowest of levels. Their proof is not backed by the rules of language or reason. It is only a far-fetched hallucination that this kind of ‘proof’ can have any religious significance.

I do not consider it far-fetched that those behind this fabrication intentionally chose this type of ludicrousness with the intention of distancing the youth and the intelligentsia of the Shī‘ah from Islam. When they see the illogical nature of these proofs and their likes, whilst believing that this is Islam, they will most certainly doubt the truth of Islam itself. This is in fact one of the long-term objectives of this group, who have been relentlessly planning and plotting against the Ummah and its religion.

A point that begs to be highlighted in the above quotation is their attack on the Rasūl ﷺ. They claim that he initially failed to uphold the command of his Lord, and thus disobeyed Him. In this way, they have tried to tarnish the image of the one who was truly infallible. The irony of the matter is that they are the same people who exceed the limits in claiming the infallibility of those who are not even Ambiyā’ (i.e. the Imāms). It should be remembered that bad-mouthing a Nabī is disbelief.² He is further discredited in the above quotation, as they portray

1 Refer to *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 24/24, *Tafsīr al-Qurṭubī* 15/276-277, *al-Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ* (by Abū Ḥayyān) 7/438, *Faṭḥ al-Qadīr* (by al-Shawkānī) 4/474, *Rūḥ al-Ma‘ānī* (by al-Ālūsī) 24/23-24

2 Refer to *Risālah fī al-Radd ‘alā al-Rāfiḍah* pg. 6

him as one who was dominated by fear of his people owing to which he would hesitate in carrying out the commands of his Lord. Hence, they state that he did not change his stance until the warning of his deeds being void of acceptance was sounded to him.

b. Second verse

Another example of this kind of distortion is their interpretation of the verse:

فَهَلْ إِلَىٰ خُرُوجٍ مِّن سَبِيلٍ

So is there any way to an exit?¹

This is a question that will be asked by the polytheists, to whom it will be told:

ذَلِكُمْ بِأَنَّهُ إِذَا دُعِيَ اللَّهُ وَحْدَهُ كَفَرْتُمْ

This is because, when Allah alone was invoked you disbelieved.²

In other words, you are facing this punishment due to your aversion (in the worldly life) from the belief that Allah alone should be called upon and your rejection of the Oneness of Allah. Conversely:

وَإِنْ يُشْرَكَ بِهِ تُؤْمِنُوا

But when partners were associated with Him you believed.

Allah explains the reason as to why they will not be entertained when they will plea to be removed from hellfire, i.e. their refusal to accept the Oneness of Allah and their insistence upon associating a partner with him in worship, at the core of which is *Du'ā'* (invocation). Thus, this verse as well as the one that precedes is a

1 Sūrah al-Ghāfir: 11

2 Sūrah Ghāfir: 12

description of the punishment that will be apportioned for the polytheists in the hereafter. They will be doomed to hell forever, with no possibility of them ever emerging therefrom. They will beg to be returned to the worldly life, only for their plea to be ignored, since they associated partners with Allah by worshipping others along with Him.¹

The Shī'ah, however, narrate from their Imāms an interpretation very different from that of the Muslims:

عن أبي جعفر في قوله عز وجل ذُكِرْكُمْ بِأَنَّهُ إِذَا دُعِيَ اللَّهُ وَحْدَهُ كَفَرْتُمْ بِأَن لِّعَلِيٍّ وَلَايَةً وَإِنْ يُشْرَكَ بِهِ مِنْ لَيْسَتْ لَهُ وَلَايَةٌ تُوْمِنُوا فَالْحُكْمُ لِلَّهِ الْعَلِيِّ الْكَبِيرِ

It is narrated from Abu Ja'far regarding the verse, *"This is because, when Allah was called upon alone, you disbelieved"* that 'Alī is deserving of Wilāyah. *"But if others were associated with Him"* who did not deserve Wilāyah, *"you believed. So the judgment is with Allah, the Most High, and the Grand."*^{2,3}

It is obvious that this interpretation is very akin to the interpretations of the Bāṭiniyyah. Neither do the words of the verse nor does its context lend any support to it. It is for this reason that the author of *Majma' al-Bayān* shunned these interpretations of his sect, which they allegedly report from their Imāms and explained the verse in light of its apparent meaning and the sayings of the *Salaf*.⁴ However, moderate views do not survive in environments that are dominated by Taqiyyah.

There are many other examples of their erroneous interpretations, which are very similar to that which has already been discussed.

1 Refer to *Tafsīr Ṭabarī* 24/48, *Tafsīr al-Baghawī* 4/93-94, *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 4/79-80, *Faṭḥ al-Qadīr* 4/484, *Tafsīr al-Qāsimī* 14/227, Ibn Sa'dī: *Taysīr al-Karīm al-Raḥmān* 6/512 etc.

2 Sūrah al-Ghāfir: 12

3 Al-Barqī: *Kanz Jam' al-Fawā'id* pg. 277, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 23/364, *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/256, *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/421, *al-Burhān* 4/93-94, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 4/337

4 *Majma' al-Bayān* 5/186

c. Third verse

We present to you a third example. This one is regarding the verse:

أَلِلَّهِ مَعَ اللَّهِ بَلْ أَكْثَرُهُمْ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ

Is there a deity with Allah?¹

Their concocted narrations state:

قال أبو عبد الله أي إمام هدى مع إمام ضلال في قرن واحد

Abū ‘Abd Allāh said, “The Imām of guidance with the Imām of deviation in one era.”²

This narration and its likes create a fertile ground for the rest of their extremist views, such as taking ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as a deity, the manifestation of which we see amidst them from time the time. The reality is that this verse has absolutely no connection with their Imāms. Rather, the Oneness of Allah is being established, as Allah says (in the preceding verses):

قُلِ الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ وَسَلَامٌ عَلَى عِبَادِهِ الَّذِينَ اصْطَفَىٰ اللَّهُ خَيْرٌ أَمَّا يُشْرِكُونَ أَمَّنْ خَلَقَ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضَ وَأَنْزَلَ لَكُمْ مِنَ السَّمَاءِ مَاءً فَأَنْبَتْنَا بِهِ حَدَائِقَ ذَاتَ بَهْجَةٍ مَا كَانَ لَكُمْ أَنْ تُنبِتُوا شَجَرَهَا أَلِلَّهِ مَعَ اللَّهِ بَلْ هُمْ قَوْمٌ يَعْدِلُونَ

Say, (O Muḥammad), “Praise be to Allah, and peace upon His servants whom He has chosen. Is Allah better or that which they associate with Him? Is he not the being who created the heavens and the earth and showered for you rains from the sky, wherewith he produced orchards of joyful beauty? It is beyond your capacity to create of it a tree. Is there a deity with Allah? [No], but they are a people who ascribe equals (to Him).”³

1 Sūrah al-Naml: 61

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 23/391, *Kanz Jāmi‘ al-Fawā'id* pg. 207

3 Sūrah al-Naml: 59-60

At the end of each verse, Allah says:

أَلِلَّهِ مَعَ اللَّهِ

Is there a deity with Allah?

In other words, is there any other deity who is doing all of this along with Allah? This is a rhetorical question, the purpose of which is the negation of all other deities, as the polytheists had accepted that none besides Allah was responsible for the above-mentioned. The verse proved to them that the outcome of their own logic and understanding is that none besides Allah was deserving of being worshipped.¹

d. Fourth verse

A fourth example of these interpretations is their explanation of the verse:

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ قَبْلِكَ مِنْ رَسُولٍ إِلَّا نُوحِي إِلَيْهِ أَنَّهُ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا أَنَا فَاعْبُدُونِ

And we sent not before you any messenger except that we revealed to him that, “There is no deity except me, so worship me.”²

Those who fabricated the narrations of this sect wished to either challenge this verse or contradict it. Hence, they say (whilst explaining the verse):

ما بعث الله نبياً قط إلا بولايتنا والبراء من أعدائنا

Allah did not send any Nabī but to support us and dissociate himself from our enemies.³

1 *Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwīyyah* pg. 25

2 *Sūrah al-Anbiyā'*: 25

3 *Al-Burhān* 2/367, *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī*, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 3/134

Another narration states:

ولايتنا ولاية الله التي لم يبعث نبيًا قط إلا بها

Allegiance to us is allegiance to Allah. No Nabī was ever sent but with this.¹

Thus, they made the essence of the call of the Ambiyā' a call towards the Imāms who were not yet born.² Further, there is almost no verse in the Qur'ān in which the Oneness of Allah and the prohibition of shirk is mentioned except that they have distorted its meaning by way of these thumb-sucked narrations.

One of their scholars goes as far as claiming that this is a set principle regarding the verses of the Qur'ān. He says:

كل ما ورد ظاهره في الذين أشركوا مع الله سبحانه ربًا غيره من الأصنام التي صنعوها بأيديهم ثم عظموها وأحبوها والتزموا عبادتها وجعلوهم شركاء ربهم، وقالوا: هؤلاء شفعاؤنا عند الله بغير أمر من الله بل بأرائهم وأهوائهم، فبطنه وارد في الذين نصبوا أئمة بأيديهم وعظموهم وأحبوهم والتزموا طاعتهم وجعلوهم شركاء إمامهم الذي عينه الله لهم

All the verses, the outer meanings of which refer to those who ascribed partners to Allah in the form of idols which they crafted with their hands, honoured, loved, insisted on their worship, took them as the partners of

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/437

2 To add salt to the wound, they attribute these claims to Ja'far al-Ṣādiq and his father, whom Allah had protected from this type of heresy. The reason behind this attribution was to hoodwink their simple-minded blind followers, who refuse to use their ability to think. Thus, along the course of their life, they (the followers) are bombarded with a variety of forgeries pertaining to the difficulties endured by the Ahl al-Bayt, merits of love for the Ahl al-Bayt, the fight between the Ahl al-Bayt, and the Ṣaḥābah etc. All of these tales leave the poor victim with a heart filled with hatred and rancour for the noble Ṣaḥābah عليه السلام as well as all other Muslims. It is thus necessary to dedicate a special study to the psychological effects that these narrations leave on the mind of the common-man and the incidences to which they eventually lead. This will reveal the dangerous nature of these forgeries. Once the cause of the trouble is identified, it will be easier to minimise its effects. Also, it will reveal the extent to which the Bāṭiniyyah connived against the Ummah and its religion.

their Rabb and said—based on their own whims and views, without any such instruction from Allah—“These are our interceders before Allah;” they are inwardly regarding those who appointed Imāms with their own hands, respected them, loved them, took it upon themselves to obey them, and made them partners along with the Imām who Allah had appointed for them....¹

The fact that they could stipulate this as a principle means that their narrations are replete with this nonsense. They have openly admitted this:

إنّ الأخبار متضاربة في تأويل الشّرك بالله والشّرك بعبادته بالشّرك في الولاية والإمامة؛ أي يشرك مع الإمام من ليس من أهل الإمامة، وأن يتخذ مع ولاية آل محمد رضي الله عنهم (أي الأئمة الاثنا عشر) ولاية غيرهم

The narrations are replete with interpretations wherein associating a partner with Allah and worshipping others along with him are interpreted to mean Wilāyah and Imāmah. That is, to appoint an unworthy person with the Imām and to support anyone else alongside the family of Muḥammad ﷺ i.e. the Twelve Imāms.²

In this way, the meanings of all the verses in the Qur’ān pertaining to the subject of the Oneness of Allah and the prohibition of ascribing a partner to him have been distorted by the Shī’ah. The actual meanings of these verses are lost and converted to the Wilāyah and Imāmah of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and the subsequent Imāms. They were not bothered by the fact that these verses were clear, definite, and explicit in their meanings. Thus, these interpretations are the key to all evil and the door to all types of trouble.³ This cannot be doubted for they are tempering with the very core of Islam toward which all the Ambiyā’ called, and for the

1 *Mir’āt al-Anwār* pg. 100, 58.

2 *Mir’āt al-Anwār* pg. 202

3 Ibn al-Qayyim wrote an important article on the damage caused by unfounded interpretations. He stated that the basis of destruction in this world as well as the hereafter is those interpretations that have not been sanctioned by Allah and His Rasūl ﷺ in their speech, nor did they indicate that this could be its meaning. Refer to *I’lām al-Muwaqqi’in* 4/240-254

establishment of which their books were revealed. They were selected solely for this mission and on this very basis will humanity be segregated into the people of heaven and the people of hell.

Before concluding our discussion on this topic, I would like to point out a narration from their books in which these interpretations have been declared invalid, and their origin has been exposed. Their tafsīr, *Al-Burhān* states:

عن حبيب بن معلى الخثعمي قال: ذكرت لأبي عبد الله رضي الله عنه ما يقول أبو الخطاب، فقال: أجل إليّ ما يقل. قال: في قوله عز وجل إذا ذكر الله وحده أنه أمير المؤمنين وإذا ذكر الذين من دونه فلان وفلان قال أبو عبد الله من قال هذا فهو مشرك بالله عز وجل ثلاثاً أنا إلى الله منهم بريء ثلاثاً بل عني الله بذلك نفسه قال فالآية الأخرى التي في حم قول الله عز وجل ذلكم بأنه إذا دعي الله وحده كفرتم ثم قلت زعم أنه يعني بذلك أمير المؤمنين صلى الله عليه وسلم. قال أبو عبد الله من قال هذا فهو مشرك بالله عز وجل ثلاثاً أنا إلى الله منهم بريء ثلاثاً بل عني الله بذلك

Ḥabīb ibn al-Mu‘allā al-Khath‘amī reports, “I mentioned to Abū ‘Abd Allāh that which Abū al-Khaṭṭāb says.”

He said, “Yes, tell me what he says.”

I said, “He says regarding the verse of Allah, ‘And when Allah is mentioned alone’, this refers to Amīr al-Mu‘mīn ‘but when those other than Him are mentioned’ this refers to so and so.”¹

Abū ‘Abd Allāh said (thrice), “The one who said this is a polytheist who has ascribed partners to Allah. I have nothing to do with them. Allah only referred to Himself. What about the other verse, in Ḥā Mīm which reads as, “That is because, when Allah was called upon alone, you disbelieved.”

I answered, “He claims that it is regarding Amīr al-Mu‘minīn.”

Abū ‘Abd Allāh exclaimed (thrice), “The one who said this is a polytheist who has associated partners with Allah. I have nothing to do with him. Allah only referred to Himself.”²

1 i.e. Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما

2 *Al-Burhān* 4/78

We have already mentioned that the interpretation of the second verse in the manner done by Abū al-Khaṭṭāb appears in a number of their reliable sources such as *al-Kāfi*, *al-Burhān*, *Al-Biḥār*, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* etc. As for the second verse, it is also interpreted by them in the heretical manner that Abū ‘Abd Allāh refuted (as confessed by them). His condemnation of their interpretations has been mentioned by the author of *al-Kāfi*,¹ and the author of *Al-Biḥār*² amongst others.³ We have thus learnt that Abū ‘Abd Allāh declares the scholars of the Shī‘ah who accept these interpretations to be polytheists.

Besides these interpretations, they have many independent narrations in which this heresy is established as a principle of their religion. One narration states:

من أشرك مع إمام إمامته من عند الله من ليست إمامته من الله كان مشركا

Whoever adds as a partner to an Imām who is appointed by Allah an Imām who is not appointed by Allah, he is a polytheist.⁴

There are many other narrations which echo this meaning.⁵ One of their celebrated scholars, who is referred to as *al-Ṣadūq* (the truthful one), Ibn Bābuwayh states:

إن الله هو الذي لا يخليهم في كل زمان من إمام معصوم، فمن عبد رباً لم يقم لهم الحجة، فإنما عبد غير الله عز وجل

Undoubtedly, Allah is the One who does not leave them without an infallible Imām in every era. Therefore, whoever worships a Lord who did not appoint for them an Imām, then there is no doubt that he worshipped a (deity) other than Allah.⁶

1 *Rawḍat al-Kāfi* pg. 304

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 23/362, 368

3 Refer to al-Barqī: *Kanz Jāmi‘ al-Fawāid*

4 Al-Nu‘mānī: *al-Ghaybah* pg. 82, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/78

5 As an example, refer to *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/437

6 ‘*Ilal al-Sharā‘*” pg. 14, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 23/83

In other words, if a person believes in Allah and worships Him with sincerity but he also holds the belief that Allah did not appoint ‘Alī عليه السلام as the khalīfah, nor did He explicitly state that ‘Alī عليه السلام should be the Imām; then he has worshipped a deity besides Allah. On the basis of these texts and their likes, they managed to declare as kāfir everyone besides themselves. Al-Majlisī says:

اعلم أن إطلاق لفظ الشُّرك والكفر على من لم يعتقد إمامة أمير المؤمنين والأئمة من ولده عليهم السلام،
وفضّل عليهم غيرهم يدلّ أنّهم كفّار مخلّدون في النار

Know well! The usage of the words ‘shirk’ and ‘kufr’ is regarding those who do not believe in the Imāmah of Amīr al-Mu’minīn and the Imāms from his progeny, and give preference to others over them. This is clear that they are disbelievers who are destined to hell.¹

All of these claims have no basis in the noble Qur’ān. They are totally foreign to the religion of Islam. If they had any importance in Islam, they would have been mentioned in many verses of the Qur’ān, in an explicit and unambiguous manner. It is not possible that such an important matter was not explained to the Ummah in definite terms. Furthermore, Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم would have taught this to the ummah in a convincing and clear manner, and the entire ummah would have narrated it from him, generation after generation. It would have been among the definite and well-known aspects of Islam, instead of being a tale transmitted by a handful of fibbers.

If there was any truth to these claims, the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم—who spent their wealth, sacrificed their lives and left their homes, families and children for the sake of Islam—would have not turned away from it or hesitated in the least in upholding it. The verses of the noble Qur’ān unequivocally state that the fundamental principle and the focal point of this religion is to believe in the Oneness of Allah and to dedicate all acts of worship to Him alone. Many verses can be quoted to prove this. Allah says:

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 23/390. A few more narrations will be quoted regarding their labelling of the Ṣaḥābah and others as kāfir on the basis of them not believing in their Imāms.

وَقَضَىٰ رَبُّكَ أَلَّا تَعْبُدُوا إِلَّا إِيَّاهُ

And your Lord has decreed that you not worship except Him.¹

وَإِذْ أَخَذْنَا مِيثَاقَ بَنِي إِسْرَٰئِيلَ لَا تَعْبُدُونَ إِلَّا اللَّهَ

And (recall) when we took the covenant from the Children of Israel, [enjoining upon them], “You will not worship but Allah.”²

قُلْ إِنَّمَا أُمِرْتُ أَنْ أَعْبُدَ اللَّهَ وَلَا أُشْرِكَ بِهِ

Say, “I have only been commanded to worship Allah and not associate [anything] with Him.”³

There is absolutely no mention, anywhere in the Qur’ān of the Twelve Imāms. As we have pointed out, this is even admitted in their books. Thus, these false interpretations are a major innovation, which destroys our great religion from its very core. It opens up the doors and pathways to Shirk.

1 Sūrah al-Isrā: 23

2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 83

3 Sūrah al-Ra’d: 36

Discussion Two

Wilāyah is the Basis for the Acceptance of Deeds

In Islam, the basis for the acceptance of all actions is Tawḥīd, and they are rejected on account of *shirk* (associating partners with Allah). Allah says:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَغْفِرُ أَنْ يُشْرَكَ بِهِ وَيَغْفِرُ مَا دُونَ ذَلِكَ لِمَنْ يَشَاءُ

Indeed, Allah does not forgive association with Him, but He forgives what is less than that for whom He wills.¹

However, the Shī'ah have changed all of this to mean believing in the Twelve Imāms. They have narrations in which it is stated that the one who brings sins equivalent to the entire earth will be met with forgiveness, the pleasure of Allah, and the gardens of Paradise simply because he believed in Imāmah. On the other hand, if a person did not believe in Imāmah, he will be expelled from Jannah and thrown into the fire. They state:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ نَصَبَ عَلِيًّا عَلَمًا بَيْنَهُ وَبَيْنَ خَلْقِهِ فَمَنْ عَرَفَهُ كَانَ مُؤْمِنًا وَمَنْ أَنْكَرَهُ كَانَ كَافِرًا وَمَنْ جَهِلَهُ كَانَ ضَالًّا وَمَنْ نَصَبَ مَعَهُ شَيْئًا كَانَ مُشْرِكًا وَمَنْ جَاءَ بِوَلَايَتِهِ دَخَلَ الْجَنَّةَ

Allah made 'Alī the symbol of guidance between Him and the creation; whoever recognizes him is a believer and whoever rejects him is a disbeliever. Whoever is ignorant regarding him is deviant and whoever associates a partner to him is a polytheist. Whoever comes (to the hereafter) whilst believing in his Wilāyah will enter Jannah.²

They go on to state in their narrations:

فَإِنْ مِنْ أَقْرَبٍ بِوَلَايَتِنَا ثُمَّ مَاتَ عَلَيْهَا قَبِلَتْ مِنْهُ صَلَاتُهُ وَصَوْمُهُ وَزَكَاتُهُ وَحُجُّهُ وَإِنْ لَمْ يَقْرَبِ بِوَلَايَتِنَا بَيْنَ يَدَيِ اللَّهِ جَلَّ جَلَالُهُ لَمْ يَقْبَلِ اللَّهُ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ شَيْئًا مِنْ أَعْمَالِهِ

1 Sūrah al-Nisā: 48, 116

2 Uṣūl al-Kāfi 1/437

Whoever concedes our Wilāyah and whilst believing therein he dies, his ṣalāh, fasting, zakāh and Ḥajj, all will be accepted. And if he does not concede our Wilāyah before Allah, Allah will not accept any of his actions.¹

Abū ‘Abd Allāh said (according to their claims):

من خالفكم وإن تعبد منسوب إلى هذه الآية وُجُوهُ يَوْمَئِذٍ خَاشِعَةٌ عَامِلَةٌ نَاصِبَةٌ تَصْلَى نَارًا حَامِيَةً

Whoever opposes you, even if he may be a great worshipper, is the subject of this verse, “[Some] faces, that Day, will be humbled. Working [hard] and exhausted. They will burn in an intensely hot Fire.”^{2,3}

They claim that Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام appeared before Muḥammad صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and said to him:

يا محمد السلام يقرئك السلام ويقول خلقت السماوات السبع وما فيهن والأرضين السبع وما عليهن وما خلقت موضعاً أعظم من الركن والمقام ولو أن عبداً دعاني هناك منذ خلقت السماوات والأرضين ثم لقيني جاحداً لولاية علي لأكبيته في سقر

O Muḥammad, Allah has conveyed his greetings to you and has said, “I created the seven heavens and all therein and the seven earths and all therein. I have not created an area that is more virtuous in rank than the Rukn (Ḥajr Aswad) and Maqām (the standing place of Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام). However, if any of my bondsmen supplicates to me (being there) from the time I created the heavens and the earths and then meets me whilst rejecting the Wilāyah of ‘Alī, I will throw him face-down into hell.”⁴

They go to extremes to emphasise that the acts of worship of the one who does not believe in the Wilāyah of ‘Alī are void of acceptance. A narration states:

1 Amālī al-Ṣadūq pg. 154-155

2 Sūrah al-Ghāshiyah: 2-4

3 Tafsīr al-Qummī 2/419

4 Amālī al-Ṣadūq pg. 290, Biḥār al-Anwār 27/167

لو سجد حتى ينقطع عنقه ما قبل الله منه إلا بولايتنا أهل البيت

If he prostrates until his neck snaps, then too Allah will not accept anything except (that which is done) after believing in our Wilāyah.

As if attributing lies to Jibrīl is not enough, they go on to state that Allah said:

يا محمد لو أنّ عبدًا يعبدني حتى ينقطع ويصير كالشّنّ ثم أتاني جاحدًا لولايتهم ما أسكنته جنتي ولا أظللته تحت عرشي

O Muḥammad, if a slave exhausts himself by worshipping me to an extent where he becomes like a water-skin (lean and weak), but he comes to me rejecting their Wilāyah, I will not grant him residence in my heaven and nor will I grant him shade under my ‘Arsh.¹

They attribute the following forgeries to the Rasūl ﷺ:

لو جاء أحدكم يوم القيامة بأعمال كأمثال الجبال ولم يجيء بولاية علي بن أبي طالب لأكبه الله عز وجل بالنار

If one of you comes on the Day of Judgment with good deeds the size of mountains, but comes without believing in the Wilāyah of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, Allah will throw him headlong into hell.²

ولو أن عبدًا جاء يوم القيامة بعمل سبعين نبيًا ما قبل الله ذلك منه حتى يلقاه بولايته وولاية أهل بيته

If a slave comes on the Day of Judgment with the actions of seventy Ambiyā”, Allah will not accept from him unless he meets Him (believing in) my Wilāyah and the Wilāyah of my household.³

They believe that Tawḥīd itself cannot be accepted if it is not accompanied by the belief in Wilāyah. One of their narrations states:

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/169

2 *Amālī al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī* 1/314

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/172

قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم من قال لا إله إلا الله دخل الجنة فقال رجلان من أصحابه فنحن نقول لا إله إلا الله فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إنما تقبل شهادة أن لا إله إلا الله من هذا وشيعته ووضع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يده على رأس عليّ وقال لهما من علامة ذلك ألا تجلسا مجلسه ولا تكذبا قوله ...

Rasūl Allah ﷺ said, “Whoever says, ‘There is no deity besides Allah’ will enter paradise.”

Thereupon, two men from his companions said, “We say, ‘There is no deity besides Allah’.

The Rasūl of Allah ﷺ replied, “The testimony that there is no deity besides Allah is only accepted from this one (pointing to ‘Alī) and his followers.”

Then he placed his hand on the head of ‘Alī and said, “The sign of that (of your allegiance to him) is that you do not occupy his position and you do not belie him.”¹

This means that, according to them, Wilāyah takes precedence over the *Shahādatayn* (the testimonies of faith) and it is the basis of their acceptance. *Shahādatayn* will not be accepted from anyone besides the “followers of ‘Alī”. Belief in the doctrine of Imāmah is that which draws Allah’s pardon and forgiveness and rejecting it is the cause of His anger and punishment. Many narrations have been reported by the Shī‘ah to establish this. They report from ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, who reports from the Rasūl ﷺ who in turn reports from Jibrīl, who quotes Allah as saying:

وعزتي وجلالي لأعذبن كل رعية في الإسلام دانت بولاية إمام جائر ليس من الله عز وجل، وإن كانت الرعية في أعمالها برة تقية، ولأعفون عن كل رعية دانت بولاية إمام عادل من الله تعالى، وإن كانت الرعية في أعمالها طالحة سيئة

By my honour and grandeur I will punish all people who lived under an undeserving Imām who was not appointed by Allah, even if they were pious

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/201

and good; and I will overlook all people who lived under a rightful Imām who was appointed by Allah, even if their actions were evil and wicked.¹

They have a huge amount of narrations regarding this belief, most of which are mentioned by the author of *Biḥār al-Anwār*, e.g. under the chapter, ‘They عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ are the people of A’rāf...none will enter Jannah, except those who recognize them and whom they recognize’², he has cited twenty narrations. Thereafter, he has quoted seventy one narrations under the chapter, ‘Actions are not accepted except by believing in Wilāyah.’³

None of these narrations have any basis in Islam. The Book of Allah is in our midst. It does not contain any of their claims. It is the original source and the ultimate judge in any Islamic matter. The noble Qur’ān states that the basis for the acceptance of actions is Tawḥīd and the basis for rejection thereof is shirk. Allah says:

إِنَّهُ مَنْ يُشْرِكْ بِاللَّهِ فَقَدْ حَرَّمَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ الْجَنَّةَ وَمَأْوَاهُ النَّارُ

Indeed, he who associates others with Allah, Allah has forbidden for him Paradise, and his refuge is the Fire.⁴

إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَغْفِرُ أَنْ يُشْرَكَ بِهِ وَيَغْفِرُ مَا دُونَ ذَلِكَ لِمَنْ يَشَاءُ

Indeed, Allah does not forgive association with Him, but He forgives anything besides that for whom He wills.⁵

The heresy of the Shī’ah is refuted in the Qur’ān. Allah says:

1 Al-Nu’ mānī: *al-Ghaybah* pg. 83, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/201

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/247-256

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/166-202

4 Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 72

5 Sūrah al-Nisā: 48

مَنْ آمَنَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ وَعَمِلَ صَالِحًا فَلَهُمْ أَجْرُهُمْ عِنْدَ رَبِّهِمْ

Those (among them) who believed in Allah and the Last Day and did righteous deeds will have their reward with their Lord.¹

مَنْ آمَنَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ وَعَمِلَ صَالِحًا فَلَا خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ

Those who believed in Allah and the Last Day and did righteous deeds will not have any fear.²

They claim that believing in the Twelve Imāms is more important in Islam than ṣalāh and the other fundamentals.³ This is despite the fact that ṣalāh is explicitly mentioned in no less than eighty places in the Qur'ān, whereas their doctrine is not even mentioned once. The question that faces them is: Did Allah wish to misguide his creation or did he fail to explicate the formula of success to them. Exalted is Allah from these shameless slanders! He says:

وَمَا كَانَ اللَّهُ لِيُضِلَّ قَوْمًا بَعْدَ إِذْ هَدَاهُمْ حَتَّى يُبَيِّنَ لَهُمْ مَا يَتَّقُونَ

And Allah would not let a people stray after He has guided them until He makes clear to them what they should avoid.⁴

As usual, there are narrations which contradict the above quoted claims, but on account of its moderate nature they are quickly buried, forgotten, or brushed off as Taqiyyah by them. I will nonetheless mention them to highlight the contradictions that exist in their texts. *Tafsīr al-Furāt* states:

قال علي بن أبي طالب: سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول لما نزلت قل لَا أَسْأَلُكُمْ عَلَيْهِ أَجْرًا إِلَّا الْمَوَدَّةَ فِي الْقُرْبَى [الشورى، آية: ٢٣]. قال جبرائيل يا محمد إن لكل دين أصلاً ودعامة وفرعاً وبنیاناً

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 62

2 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 69

3 Refer to the chapter of Imāmah in this book.

4 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 115

وإن أصل الدين ودعامته قول لا إله إلا الله وإن فرعه وبنياه محبتكم أهل البيت ومواليتكم فيما وافق الحق ودعا إليه

‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib said, “I heard Rasūl Allah ﷺ saying upon the revelation of the verse, ‘Say, I do not ask you for it (this message) any payment but only affection due to kinship.’¹ Jibrīl said, ‘O Muḥammad, every religion has a basis and foundation upon which rests its branches and structure. The foundation and basis of religion is the utterance of ‘There is no deity besides Allah’ and its branches and structure is the love for you the Ahl al-Bayt in matters that conform to the truth and advocate it.’”²

This text goes against their narrations, as it confirms that the basis of the religion is the declaration of Tawḥīd, instead of Wilāyah and it also states that loving the Ahl al-Bayt is only a branch, which is conditional to their conformity to the truth.

1 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 23

2 Tafsīr Furāt pg. 148-149, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 23/247

Discussion Three

Their Belief that the Imāms are the Intermediaries between Allah and the creation

The Shī'ah claim that their twelve Imāms are the intermediaries between Allah and His creation. Al-Majlisī says regarding his Imāms:

فإنهم حجب الرب والوسائط بينه وبين الخلق

They are the veils of the lord and the intermediaries between Him and the creation.¹

In fact, he dedicated an entire chapter to this claim titled, 'People cannot be guided except through them and they are the intermediaries between the creation and Allah and none will enter Jannah except those who recognised them.'² One of their narrations state that Abu 'Abd Allāh said:

نحن السبب بينكم وبين الله عز وجلّ

We are the intermediate between you and Allah.³

In the book *'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah*, it is stated that the twelve Imāms are:

أبواب الله والسبل إليه... إنهم كسفينة نوح من ركبها نجا ومن تخلف عنها غرق

The doors and the pathways that lead to Allah... They are like the ship of Nūḥ. Whoever climbs aboard will be saved and whoever stays behind will drown.⁴

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 23/97

2 *ibid*

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 23/101

4 *'Aqā'id al-Imāmah* by al-Muẓaffar pg. 98-99

Furthermore, the Muslims believe that the Ambiyā' are the ones who convey the message and commands of Allah to His creation. The Imāmiyyah, on the other hand, believe that this responsibility lies upon the shoulders of the Imāms as well. According to them, the Imāms receive revelation from Allah, as explained under the chapter regarding their beliefs regarding the Sunnah. That is not all: they even attribute to them such things which a Muslim believes to be the doing of Allah alone. This removes the one who believes in them from the religion of Tawḥīd to the religion of shirk.

A few examples of these polytheistic beliefs and acts are:

- Believing that the guidance of the creation lies in the hands of the Imāms,
- Supplications are not accepted unless their names are invoked,
- They are to be called for help at the time of difficulty,
- Pilgrimage is carried out to their graves,
- Ḥajj to their graves is greater than to the House of Allah (which Allah made as a sign for humanity),
- Karbalā' has more sanctity than the Ka'bah,
- The visitation of these graves have rites that are necessary to carry out (which are referred to as Manāsik al-Mashāhid),
- Ṭawāf is done of these graves and they are taken as the Qiblah just like the sanctified House of Allah.

If Allah permits, I will quote for you these beliefs, without any dishonesty, from the reliable books of the Shī'ah. However, before presenting these quotations, I would like to highlight the fact that the concept of an intermediate between Allah and His creation is one that is completely foreign to Islamic teachings. Rather, it is a doctrine that was upheld by the polytheists. The very purpose of the Ambiyā' was to liberate humanity from this type of polytheism. There are no barriers between a Muslim and his Lord. He does not need to turn to an intermediary

when carrying out acts of worship or supplication. Allah says:

وَإِذَا سَأَلَكَ عِبَادِي عَنِّي فَإِنِّي قَرِيبٌ أُجِيبُ دَعْوَةَ الدَّاعِ إِذَا دَعَانِ فَلْيَسْتَجِيبُوا لِي وَلْيُؤْمِنُوا بِي لَعَلَّهُمْ
يُرْشَدُونَ

And when my servants ask you concerning me—indeed I am near. I respond to the invocations of the caller when he calls upon me. So let them respond to me [by obedience] and believe in me so that they be [rightly] guided.¹

ادْعُونِي أَسْتَجِبْ لَكُمْ إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَسْتَكْبِرُونَ عَنْ عِبَادَتِي سَيَدْخُلُونَ جَهَنَّمَ دَاخِرِينَ

And your Rabb says, “Call upon me; I will respond to you.” Indeed, those who disdain my worship will enter Hell contemptibly.²

The people of knowledge are unanimous upon the fact that the one who places an intermediary between himself and Allah by relying upon him, asking him to fulfil his needs or supplicating to him has committed shirk and left the fold of Islam, as these were the beliefs of the polytheists. Allah relates the excuse that they would present for their acts:

مَا نَعْبُدُهُمْ إِلَّا لِيُقَرِّبُونَا إِلَى اللَّهِ زُلْفَى

We only worship them so that they bring us nearer to Allah in position.³

When Ibn Taymiyah was asked regarding one who says, “It is necessary for us to have an intermediary between us and Allah, as we cannot reach Him except through it,” he replied:

If he means that we need someone to convey the laws of Allah, then this is correct. The creation cannot learn about the pleasure of Allah, His

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 186

2 Sūrah Ghāfir: 60

3 Sūrah al-Zumar: 3

commandments and prohibitions except through the Messengers, who were sent by Allah to His creation. This is a fact that is agreed upon by the Muslims, Jews and Christians. All establish this intermediary between Allah and his creation. They are undoubtedly the Messengers of Allah who conveyed His commandments and prohibitions. Allah says:

اللَّهُ يَصْطَفِي مِنَ الْمَلَائِكَةِ رُسُلًا وَمِنَ النَّاسِ

Allah chooses from the angels Messengers and from the people.¹

Whoever rejects these intermediaries is a disbeliever according to all the religions.

On the other hand, if he means that it is necessary for the slaves of Allah to have an intermediary between them and Allah to whom they should supplicate and from whom they should seek favours so as to draw good and repel harm (for example he believes that the intermediary can provide sustenance for people, help them and guide them), then this is from the most severe forms of shirk, due to which Allah declared the polytheists as disbelievers. This (declaration) was on account of them taking others as guardians and intercessors. They would attempt to draw good towards themselves and ward off evil by means of these deities.

Thus, the one who takes the messengers, angels, A'immah, or pious personalities as intermediaries and supplicates to them, depends on them, asks them for goodness or to repel evil (e.g. he asks them to forgive sins, guide hearts, remove difficulties or eliminate poverty) is a disbeliever according to the consensus of the Muslims.

He goes on to say:

Whoever establishes intermediaries between Allah and His creation, like the intermediaries between a king and his people (i.e. in the sense that

1 Sūrah al-Ḥajj: 75

they are the ones who present to Allah the needs of the creation and Allah guides the creation, helps them and provides for them as the creation asks them and they ask Allah just as the intermediaries in the court of the king are requested to ask the king for the needs of the people due to their closeness to him and the awe that is maintained for him by the public or because their requests hold greater weight) is a disbeliever and a polytheist. It is necessary to ask him to repent. If he repents (then he will become a Muslim), otherwise he will be killed.¹

Now, I will present the texts that I indicated to—in which polytheism is upheld and called towards, so that the polytheism that is hidden in Twelver Shī'ism may be seen in its true form.

a. Their belief that the guidance of mankind lies in the hands of the Imāms

Abū 'Abd Allāh says (as they allege):

بليّة الناس عظيمة إن دعوناهم لم يجيبونا وإن تركناهم لم يهتدوا بغيرنا

The calamity of the people is great. If we call them, they do not respond to our call and if we leave them they will not be guided without us.²

This quotation establishes that people cannot be guided except through the Imāms, and that people are undergoing perpetual difficulty on account of not responding to the call of the Imāms. Both of these claims (confining the guidance of the people to the Imāms and claiming that everyone is upon misguidance) are baseless lies. They go against divine texts, reason as well as reality. Another narration states:

1 Ibn Taymiyyah: *Majmū' Fatāwā* 1/121. Also refer to Abū Baṭīn: *Al-Intiṣār lī Ḥizb Allah al-Muwaḥḥidīn* pg. 30-31, killing a renegade can only take place in a legitimate Islamic state.

2 *Amālī al-Ṣadūq* pg. 363, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 23/99

قال أبو جعفر بنا عبد الله وبنا عرف الله وبنا وحد الله

Abū ‘Abd Allāh said, “It is only by means of us that Allah is worshipped, recognised, and taken as one who is free from partners.”¹

In this text, guidance is not just confined to the Imāms, but they are even declared its source. The truth is that guidance—in the sense that one is given the ability to accept the truth—is distributed only by Allah, the Rabb and the controller of hearts. He may intervene between a man and his heart and when He wishes for anything to happen he merely says “Be!” and it becomes. The Shī‘ah, by stating these narrations without any clauses, have made their Imāms partners with Allah as far as granting guidance is concerned. This is the greatest form of shirk. Allah alone is the One who guides. He has no partners.

Allah says:

مَنْ يَهْدِ اللَّهُ فَهُوَ الْمُهْتَدِي وَمَنْ يُضِلِّ فَلَنْ تَجِدَ لَهُ وَلِيًّا مُرْسِدًا

He whom Allah guides is the guided, but he whom He leaves astray – never will you find for him a protecting guide.²

Allah addressed His Nabī ﷺ saying:

إِنَّكَ لَا تَهْدِي مَنْ أَحْبَبْتَ وَلَكِنَّ اللَّهَ يَهْدِي مَنْ يَشَاءُ

Indeed you do not guide whom you like, but Allah guides whom he wills. And he is most knowing of the (rightly) guided.³

As for guidance in the form of pointing out the truth and directing people towards it, this was the responsibility of the Messengers and those who followed diligently in their footsteps. It cannot be confined to the Twelve Imāms. Allah says:

1 *Biḥār al Anwār* 23/103

2 *Sūrah a-Kahf*: 17

3 *Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ*: 56

قُلْ هَذِهِ سَبِيلِي أَدْعُو إِلَى اللَّهِ عَلَى بَصِيرَةٍ أَنَا وَمَنِ اتَّبَعَنِي

Say, “This is my way; I invite to Allah with insight, I and those who follow me.”¹

The claim that humans cannot be guided without the Imāms is indeed a bold statement against Allah.

b. Their belief that supplications are not accepted except if they contain the names of the Imāms

It is claimed by them that the one who supplicates to Allah without the Imāms cannot be successful. One of their narrations from the Imāms states:

من دعا الله بنا أفلح، ومن دعا بغيرنا هلك واستهلك

Whoever supplicates to Allah with our names will be successful and whoever supplicates with others will be ruined and destroyed.²

Their audacity reached a level where they even claimed:

إِنَّ دَعَاءَ الْأَنْبِيَاءِ اسْتَجِيبَ بِالتَّوَسُّلِ وَالْإِسْتِشْفَاعِ بِهِمْ صَلَوَاتُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِمْ أَجْمَعِينَ

The supplications of the Ambiyā’ were accepted due to considering them (the Imāms) as mediums and intercessors.³

Al-Majlisī supported this claim by means of eleven narrations.⁴ He quotes many similar narrations in the chapters regarding the conditions faced by the Ambiyā’, especially in the chapters regarding Ādam, Mūsā, and Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام. Another

1 Sūrah Yūsuf: 108

2 Al-Ṭabarī: *Bashārat al-Muṣṭafā* pg. 117-119, *Al-Biḥār* 23/103, *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 4/1142

3 This is the name of one of the chapters in *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/319

4 ibid

chapter in which these appear is the chapter regarding the miracles of Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.¹ Many narrations which convey the above meaning appears in their reliable works.² This dangerous claim is the stepping stone—in a discreet and disguised form—towards taking the Imāms as deities. They are seen as the ones to whom one should turn at the time of need, just as they are perceived to be the saviours of those who are in trouble, the protectors of those who are in fear, the direction of those who supplicate and the ones whose names have to be added to supplications in order for them to have any effect. Is there any difference between these beliefs and the beliefs held by the polytheists regarding their idols?

Yes, there is one difference! The polytheists would at least adopt monotheism at the time of extreme difficulty. Allah says:

فَإِذَا رَكِبُوا فِي الْفُلِّ دَعَوْا اللَّهَ مُخْلِصِينَ لَهُ الدِّينَ

And when they board a ship, they supplicate to Allah, with all sincerity to Him in religion (i.e. faith and hope).³

The Shī'ah, on the other hand, commit shirk in both; times of ease as well as extreme difficulty. In fact, they believe that their difficulties cannot be removed except by uttering the names of their Imāms in their supplications. One of their narrations state:

عن الرضا عليه السلام قال: لما أشرف نوح عليه السلام على الغرق دعا الله بحقنا فدفع الله عنه الغرق، ولما رمي إبراهيم في النار دعا الله بحقنا فجعل الله النار عليه بردًا وسلامًا، وإن موسى عليه السلام لما ضرب طريقًا في البحر دعا الله بحقنا فجعله ييسًا، وإن عيسى عليه السلام لما أراد اليهود قتله دعا الله بحقنا فنجي من القتل فرفعه الله

It is reported from al-Riḍā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام that he said, “When Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was about to drown, he supplicated to Allah through our right, so Allah saved him

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/334

2 As examples, refer to *Tafsir al-'Ayyāshī* 1/41, Ibn Bābuwayh: *al-Khiṣāl* 1/130, *Ma'ānī al-Akḥbār* pg. 42, al-Ṭabarsī: *al-Iḥtijāj* pg. 27-28, *Tafsīr al-Ḥasan al-'Askarī* pg. 117, 118, *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 4/1139 etc.

3 *Sūrah al-'Ankabūt*: 65

from drowning. When Ibrāhīm was thrown in the fire, he supplicated to Allah through our right, so Allah made the fire cool and peaceful for him. When Mūsā عليه السلام took the path of the sea, he supplicated to Allah through our rights, so Allah made it dry. When the Jews wanted to kill Isā عليه السلام, he supplicated to Allah by way of our rights, so Allah saved him from being killed and raised him.”¹

If the above sent shivers down your spine, then try to prepare yourself for what is still coming. As if the claim that the supplications of the Ambiyā’ were only accepted because of the Imāms was not heretical enough, they go on to claim that the conditions that came upon certain Ambiyā’ was on account of the stance held by them towards the Imāms. This is what they say regarding Ādam عليه السلام:

لما أسكنه الله الجنة مثل له النبي وعلي والحسن والحسين صلوات الله عليهم فنظر إليهم بحسد، ثم عرضت عليه الولاية فأكرها فرمته الجنة بأوراقها، فلما تاب إلى الله من حسده وأقر بالولاية ودعا بحق الخمسة محمد وعلي وفاطمة والحسن والحسين صلوات الله عليهم غفر الله له وذلك قوله فَتَلَقَّى آدَمُ مِنْ رَبِّهِ كَلِمَاتٍ

When Allah placed him in Jannah, Nabī, ‘Alī, Ḥasan, and Ḥusayn appeared before him whom he looked at with jealousy. Thereafter, Wilāyah was presented to him which he rejected. Thereupon, Jannah threw all its leaves at him. When he repented to Allah from his jealousy, accepted the Wilāyah, and supplicated regarding through the medium of the five; Muḥammad, ‘Alī, Fāṭimah, Ḥasan, and Ḥusayn; Allah forgave him. This is what is being referred to in the statement of Allah, “Then Adam received from his Lord [some] words and He accepted his repentance.”²

As for Yūnus عليه السلام, they claim that Allah kept him in the stomach of the whale due his rejection of the Wilāyah of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, and Allah only removed him when he accepted it.³

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/325, *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 4/1143

2 *Sūrah al-Baqarah*: 37

The quotation above can be found in *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 1/41 and *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/333-334

3 *Tafsīr Furat* pg. 13, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/333-334

These are the concoctions and fabrications of the Shī'ah. The message of Allah is in stark contradiction to their claims. He says:

وَلِلَّهِ الْأَسْمَاءُ الْحُسْنَىٰ فَادْعُوهُ بِهَا

And to Allah belong the best names, so invoke Him by them.¹

Allah did not say, 'invoke Him by the names of the Imāms' or 'at their graves and tombs.' Similarly, He says:

وَقَالَ رَبُّكُمْ ادْعُونِي أَسْتَجِبْ لَكُمْ

And your Lord says, "Call upon me; I will respond to you."²

If the acceptance of supplications was based upon mentioning the names of the Imāms, he would have said, "Invoke me by the names of the Imāms and I will accept". The reality is that these concoctions of the Shī'ah are actually reasons for supplications to be rejected, as the foundation for the acceptance of supplications is sincerity and not associating anyone as a partner with Allah. Allah says:

فَادْعُوا اللَّهَ مُخْلِصِينَ لَهُ الدِّينَ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْكَافِرُونَ

So invoke Allah, being sincere to Him in religion, although the disbelievers dislike it.³

وَادْعُوهُ مُخْلِصِينَ لَهُ الدِّينَ

And invoke Him, being sincere to Him in religion.⁴

1 Sūrah al-A'rāf: 180

2 Sūrah Ghāfir: 60

3 Sūrah Ghāfir: 14

4 Sūrah al-A'rāf: 29

These Imāms are from the human race. They are no different. Allah says:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ تَدْعُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ عِبَادٌ أَمْثَلُكُمْ فَادْعُوهُمْ فَلْيَسْتَجِيبُوا لَكُمْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ

Indeed, those whom you call upon besides Allah are servants just like you.

So call upon them and let them respond to you, if you should be truthful.¹

As far as worshipping Allah and invoking him is concerned, He did not place any pious person, angel, or Nabī in between. All are the slaves of Allah. He says:

لَنْ يَسْتَنْكِفَ الْمَسِيحُ أَنْ يَكُونَ عَبْدًا لِلَّهِ وَلَا الْمَلَائِكَةُ الْمُقَرَّبُونَ

Never would the Messiah ever be disdained to be a servant of Allah, nor would the angels near (o Him in status)]²

إِنْ كُلُّ مَنْ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ إِلَّا آتِي الرَّحْمَنِ عَبْدًا

There is no one in the heavens and earth but that he will appear before the Most Merciful as a servant.³

The nurturing that a Shī'ī undergoes by saying all of his supplications and invocations to Allah in the above-stated manner is indeed dangerous. The seeds of turning towards a being other than Allah are planted in his heart and mind. The tendency of turning towards humans instead of Allah grows within him. He is then enveloped in this type of polytheistic beliefs and his children and grandchildren are made to follow suit. At times, it reaches such extremes that he completely forgets Allah, as the names of Imāms are always on his tongue and heart at the time of supplicating. This is the end result of following his seniors and uttering those words.

1 Sūrah al-A'rāf: 194

2 Sūrah al-Nisā: 172

3 Sūrah Maryam: 93

Some of their narrations explicitly support this. It is stated in one narration that a Shī'ī wrote to his Imām complaining to him or asking him:

إِنَّ الرَّجُلَ يَحِبُّ أَنْ يَفْضِيَ إِلَى إِمَامِهِ مَا يَحِبُّ أَنْ يَفْضِيَ إِلَى رَبِّهِ

A man wishes to say to his Imām that which he wishes to say to His Rabb.

The reply was:

إِذَا كَانَتْ لَكَ حَاجَةٌ فَحَرِّكْ شَفَتَيْكَ، فَإِنَّ الْجَوَابَ يَأْتِيكَ

When you have a need, move your lips. A reply will come to you.¹

It is as if they are quicker to respond and have a greater ability to fulfil needs. The extremism of this shirk makes the shirk of the pre-Islamic era seem mild. The bitter fruits of these tales can be witnessed at the graves of the Imāms. The preposterousness of the claim that the supplications of the Ambiyā' were accepted only after they invoked the Imāms as intermediaries is self-evident, as the Imāms did not exist in the lifetime of the Ambiyā'. It is also a call towards shirk, as they (Twelvers) believe that the basis for the acceptance of supplications is the mention of the Imāms names. This is not dissimilar to the claims of the polytheists that their idols would draw them closer to Allah. Their claim is debunked in the Qur'ān, as Allah states that the Ambiyā' called out to Him alone, using nothing besides His blessed name. He says regarding Yūnus عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ:

فَتَنَادَى فِي الظُّلُمَاتِ أَنْ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا أَنْتَ سُبْحَانَكَ إِنِّي كُنْتُ مِنَ الظَّالِمِينَ

And he called out within the darkness, "There is no deity except you; exalted are you. Indeed, I have been of the wrongdoers."²

The statement uttered by Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and his honourable wife was recorded by Allah and conveyed to us. The Qur'ān quotes them:

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 94/22

2 *Sūrah al-Anbiyā'*: 87

قَالَا رَبَّنَا ظَلَمْنَا أَنْفُسَنَا وَإِنْ لَمْ تَغْفِرْ لَنَا وَتَرْحَمْنَا لَنَكُونَنَّ مِنَ الْخَاسِرِينَ

They said, “Our Lord, we have wronged ourselves, and if you do not forgive us and have mercy upon us, we will surely be among the losers.”¹

The aforementioned narration of the Shī'ah, therefore, is an outright forgery, for those who know what Islam is about. It has emerged from the whimsical fantasy of a disbeliever and endeavoured to inject polytheism into Islamic beliefs. Allah says regarding such people:

يُرِيدُونَ لِيُطْفِئُوا نُورَ اللَّهِ بِأَفْوَاهِهِمْ وَاللَّهُ مُتِمُّ نُورِهِ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْكَافِرُونَ

They want to extinguish the light of Allah with their mouths, but Allah will perfect His light, although the disbelievers dislike it.²

The irony of it all is that the narrations regarding the supplications of the Imāms to Allah in the books of the Shī'ah belie this belief of theirs. Amīr al-Mu'minīn would say, as recorded in their books:

إلهي أفكر في عفوك فتتهون عليّ خطيئتي، ثم أذكر العظيم من أخذك فتعظم عليّ بليتي، ثم قال: آه إن أنا قرأت في الصحف سيئة أنا ناسيها وأنت محصيها، فتقول: خذوه! فيا له من مأخوذ لا تنجيهِ عشيرته، ولا تنفعه قبيلته

O my lord! I ponder over your (willingness to) pardon due to which my sins seem trivial to me. Then I ruminate over the severity of your punishment, and my tribulation thus seems overwhelming to me. Aah! (How will I fair?) If I read in the scroll of deeds a sin that I had forgotten but you had recorded. You thereafter say “Grab him!” Pity upon the one who will be held without his relatives being of any avail to him and his tribe of any benefit.³

1 Sūrah al-A'rāf: 23

2 Sūrah al-Şaff: 8

3 *Amālī al-Şadūq* pg. 48, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 94/92

The above is not a rare supplication. In fact, many such supplications are narrated from each Imām. Al-Majlisī narrates most of them in his *Biḥār*.¹

c. Istighāthah from the Imāms

Istighāthah² is only sought from Allah. However, the Shī'ah call towards seeking Istighāthah from their Imāms in matters which are not in the control of anyone besides Allah. Some narrations stipulate a specific role for each Imām. One narration says:

”.. أمّا عليّ بن الحسين فللنّجاة من السّلاطين ونفث الشّياطين، وأمّا محمّد بن علي وجعفر بن محمّد فلاخّرة وما تبتغيه من طاعة الله عزّ وجلّ، وأمّا موسى بن جعفر فالتمس به العافية من الله عزّ وجلّ، وأمّا عليّ بن موسى فاطلب به السّلامة في البراري والبحار، وأمّا محمّد بن علي فاستنزل به الرّزق من الله تعالى، وأمّا عليّ بن محمّد فللتّوافل وبرّ الإخوان وما تبتغيه من طاعة الله عزّ وجلّ، وأمّا الحسن بن عليّ فلاخّرة، وأمّا صاحب الزّمان فإذا بلغ منك السّيف الذّبح فاستعن به فإنّه يعينك

Seeking the help of ‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn is to be safe from the tyranny of rulers and from the spells of the devils, as to Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī and Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad, their help is sought for matters of afterlife and in order to attain the obedience of Allah. Mūsā ibn Ja‘far, seek through his medium overall well-being from Allah. Seek protection in desserts and the oceans through ‘Alī ibn Mūsā. Draw your sustenance from Allah with Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī. The help of ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad should be sought for non-obligatory acts, good behaviour towards brothers and that which you seek from the obedience of Allah. Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī is for the hereafter. If you are about to be slain with a sword then call out to the Imām of the era (Mahdī), and he will help you.³

1 Especially in the 94th volume.

2 Istighāthah means to call for help. It is similar to du‘ā, except that it is done specifically at the time of difficulty, whereas supplication is done at all times. Refer to Ibn Taymiyah: *al-Radd ‘alā al-Bakrī* pg. 88, Sulaymān ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb: *Taysīr al-‘Azīz al-Ḥamīd* pg. 214-215, Ibn Sa‘dī: *al-Qawl al-Sadīd* pg 48-49

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 94/33

The author of *Al-Biḥār* followed this by a supplication which included all of these unacceptable forms of Istighāthah, which he considered an explanation of the text.¹ Al-Majlisī stated regarding them:

الشِّفاء الأكبر والدِّواء الأعظم لمن استشفى بهم

The greatest cure and the greatest medicine is for the one who seeks cure through them.²

According to them, the Imāms are the ones from whom help should be sought and in who one places his reliance. Thus, a Shīʿī turns his attention towards his Imām (as stated in their narrations) and says regarding their awaited Imām:

أركان البلاد وقضاة الأحكام وأبواب الإيمان.. منائح العطاء بكم إنفاذه محتومًا مقرونًا فما شيء منه إلا وأنتم له السبب وإليه السبيل.. فلا نجاة ولا مفرج إلا أنتم ولا مذهب عنكم يا عين الله الناظرة

The pillars of the countries, the judges of the law, the doors of Īmān... the givers of gifts! It is by your blessing that a task is accomplished in a definite and joint manner. There is nothing thereof except that you are its cause and pathway... there is no way to being saved and no place of refuge except you. It is not possible to go away from you, O seeing eyes of Allah...³

The attribution of aspects that are the sole prerogative of Allah to the Imāms in the above text is quite evident. They are considered the cause behind all happenings, there is no refuge but with them, granting favours becomes definite through them etc. There are many more invocations that resemble the above quoted one as far as deviation and extremism regarding the Imāms is concerned. They go to the extent of declaring them the creators of the earth and the heavens. These can be found in their compilations on invocations such as *Mafātīḥ al-Jinān*, *ʿUmdat al-Zāʿir*, etc. These also appear in their reliable books under the chapters

1 ibid

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 94/33

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 94/37

concerning the tombs and invocations. Studying and analysing them would require a separate discussion. You will see the true and appalling face of Saba'ism in invocations which suggest that 'Alī was a deity.

They even write letters and place them on the graves of the Imāms, as they believe that these graves (which cannot harm or benefit anyone) are the stations of hope and the places that are to be rushed to at the time of need. They say:

إذا كان لك حاجة إلى الله عزّ وجلّ فآكتب رقعة على بركة الله، واطرحها على قبر من قبور الأئمة إن شئت،
أو فشدّها واختمها واعجن طيناً نظيفاً واجعلها فيه، واطرحها في نهر جارٍ، أو بئر عميقة، أو غدير ماء، فإنّها
تصل إلى السيّد عليه السّلام وهو يتولّى قضاء حاجتك بنفسه

If you need something from Allah, write a note with the blessings of Allah and throw it upon one of the graves of the Imāms, if you want. Alternatively, tie it up, put a seal on it, knead clean soil, place it inside and throw it in a flowing river, deep well, or a pool of water. It will definitely reach the Master and he will personally fulfil your need.¹

Thereafter, they explain the manner in which the note should be written:

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم، كتبت إليك يا مولاي صلوات الله عليك مستغيثاً.. فأغثني يا مولاي صلوات
الله عليك عند اللّهُف، وقَدِّم المسألة لله عزّ وجلّ في أمري قبل حلول التّلف وشماتة الأعداء، فبك
بسّطت النّعمة عليّ، وأسأل الله (الخطاب للإمام في قبره) جلّ جلاله لي نصراً عزيزاً

In the name of Allah, the entirely merciful, the most gracious. I write to you O my master, may the blessings of Allah be upon you, asking for help... So help me, O my master (may the blessings of Allah be upon you) at the time of distress and present my matter to Allah before destruction comes my way and the enemies celebrate. It is only because of you that bounties have become my lot. (And addressing the Imām) Allah help me with a mighty victory.²

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 94/29

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 94/29-30

Then he should climb up at a river or pool and call out to one of the doors¹ of the awaited one saying:

يا فلان بن فلان سلام الله عليك، أشهد أنّ وفاتك في سبيل الله وأنت حيّ عند الله مرزوق، وقد خاطبتك في حياتك التي لك عند الله جلّ وعزّ، وهذه رفعتي وحاجتي إلى مولانا عليه السّلام فسلمها إليه فأنت الثقة الأمين

O so and so! May the greetings of Allah be upon you! I testify that your death was in the path of Allah and you are alive by Allah, receiving sustenance. I speak to you in your life that you have by Allah. This is my request and need to our master عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, so hand it to him as you are reliable and trustworthy.²

They state:

ثم ارم بها في النهر وكأنّك تخيل لك أنّك تسلمها إليه

Thereafter, throw it in the river and imagine that you are handing it to him.³

There are many letters (not just notes) that are sent to this non-existent awaited one. Genealogists and historians who have researched the subject have found that the person who is anticipated by the Shī'ah was never born as Ḥasan al-'Askarī passed away without having any children, as will be discussed. It is for this reason that Ibn Taymiyyah said regarding him:

He has no reality and he never existed.⁴

1 There are four doors, i.e. 'Uthmān ibn Sa'd, his son Muḥammad, Ḥasan ibn Rūḥ and 'Alī al-Samarī. *Biḥār al-Anwār* 94/30. Refer to the chapter on Ghaybah in this book as well.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 94/3

3 *ibid*

4 *Majmū' Fatāwā* 28/401

Despite this, they have fabricated narrations to establish that it is part of the religion to send notes to the non-existent one seeking his help in such matters that are in the sole control of Allah. Another example of this is:

تكتب رقعة إلى صاحب الزمان وتكتب فيها ”بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم، توسلت بحجة الله الخلف الصالح محمد بن الحسن بن علي بن محمد بن علي بن موسى بن جعفر بن محمد بن علي بن الحسين بن علي بن أبي طالب، النبأ العظيم، والضراط المستقيم، والجبل المتين، عصمة الملجأ، وقسيم الجنة والنار أتوسل إليك بأبائك الطاهرين.. وأمّهاتك الطاهرات، الباقيات الصالحات.. أن تكون وسيلتي إلى الله عز وجل في كشف ضرّي وحل عقدي وفرج حسرتي، وكشف بليتي...“

A note should be written to the Imām of the era in which it should be stated, “In the name of Allah, the entirely Merciful, the most Gracious. I take as an intermediary the proof of Allah, the pious successor Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Mūsā ibn Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib; who is the great news, the straight path, the strong rope, the protection of the refugee, the divider of (the inhabitants) Heaven and Hell. I ask you through the blessings of your pure fathers... and your pure mothers, who were embodiments of unceasing good that you be an intermediary for me by Allah for removing my plight, solving my problem, removing my regret and eliminating my dilemma...”¹

They continue:

ثم تكتب رقعة أخرى لله سبحانه وتطيب الرقعتين، وتُحمل رقعة الباري تعالى في رقعة الإمام رضي الله عنه وتطرّحهما في نهر جارٍ أو بئر ماء بعد أن تجعلهما في طين حرّ

Then, another note should be written for Allah and subsequently, both should be fragranced. The note to Allah should be placed inside the note to the Imām and both should be thrown in a flowing river or in a well, after they are placed in hot soil.²

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 94/29

2 This means such soil which has no pebbles in it. *Biḥār al-Anwār* 94/28

Look at the titles with which the non-existent Imām is addressed. He is described as; the protection of the refugee, the one who removes regrets and eliminates dilemmas. These are attributes that are not used for any being besides the one who answers the call of the hard-pressed when he supplicates and removes evil; the one who guides to the straight path those who turn in submission to Him, i.e. Allah. However, these people have assigned these attributes to one who does not even exist. Ponder over the sentence that appears towards the end of the quotation, i.e. “The note to Allah should be placed inside the note to the Imām”. It is as if they have placed their Imām at the fore-front at the time of seeking their needs.

Al-Majlisī quotes another supplication to the awaited one. This one reads:

ارجع فيما أنت بسبيله إلى الله تعالى، واستعن بصاحب الزمان عليه السلام، واتخذك مفزعاً، فإنه نعم المعين، وهو عصمة أوليائه المؤمنين.. وقل: السلام عليك يا إمام المسلمين والمؤمنين، السلام عليك يا وارث علم النبيين، السلام عليك يا عصمة الدين، السلام عليك يا معز المؤمنين المستضعفين، السلام عليك يا مذل الكافرين المتكبرين الظالمين، السلام عليك يا مولاي يا صاحب الزمان.. يا مولاي، حاجتي كذا وكذا فاشفع لي في نجاحها

Turn to Allah in your affairs and seek help from the Imām of the era. Take him as your place of refuge, as he is the best helper and protector of his believing friends... Say, “Peace be upon you, O Imām of the Muslims and Mu’mins, peace be upon you, O heir of the knowledge of the Ambiyā’, peace be upon you, O protector of the religion, peace be upon you O the honourer of the weak believers, peace be upon you, O the disgracer of the oppressive and proud disbelievers, peace be upon you, O my master, O the man of the era...O my master! These are my needs, so intercede for me for its success.”¹

How is it that the ‘man of the era’ is described in the above manner when, according to them, he was unable to appear before his followers due to his fear of being killed (as stated in their authentic narrations—which will appear later)?

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 94/31-32

How is it that a being like him is asked to fulfil needs, which can only be fulfilled by the remover of all difficulties (i.e. Allah)? The Imām is unable to protect himself, which is why he has been hiding in his cave, far out of the sight of everyone!

d. Their belief that Ḥajj to the tombs is greater than Ḥajj to the House of Allah

Ibn Taymiyyah says:

Reliable people have informed me that amongst them are those who believe that Ḥajj to the tombs is greater than Ḥajj to the Ka'bah. Thus, they believe that committing shirk is greater than worshipping Allah alone. This is the greatest form of faith in the devil.¹

This matter, regarding which a scholar from the Ahl al-Sunnah—who went the extra mile to follow the developments in the Rāfiḍī camp—stated that it reached him through reliable sources is openly declared in the reliable books of the Shī'ah. Tens of narrations emphatically state that visiting the tombs is greater than Ḥajj to the sanctified House of Allah. The following is stated in *al-Kāfī* and other books:

إن زيارة قبر الحسين تعدل عشرين حجة، وأفضل من عشرين عمرة وحجة

Visiting the grave of Ḥusayn is equivalent to twenty Ḥajj, and greater than twenty Ḥajj and 'Umrahs.²

On one occasion, a follower said to the Imām:

إنني حججت تسع عشرة حجة، وتسع عشرة عمرة

I performed Ḥajj nine times and 'Umrah nineteen times.

1 *Mihāj al-Sunnah* 2/124

2 *Furū' al-Kāfī* 1/324, Ibn Bābuwayh: *Thawāb al-A'māl* pg. 52, al-Ṭūsī: *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* 2/16, Ibn Qūluwayh: *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* pg. 161, Al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī: *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 10/348

The Imām (sarcastically) replied:

حَجَّ حَجَّةً أُخْرَى، واعتمر عمرة أُخْرَى، تكتب لك زيارة قبر الحسين عليه السَّلام

Perform one more Hajj and one more ‘Umrah, you will get the reward of visiting the grave of Ḥusayn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام.¹

It is as if he is saying, ‘Why did you undertake all the difficulty when visiting the grave of Ḥusayn is greater than your acts?’ He asks him to undertake one more Hajj and one more ‘Umrah for this reward to be accrued instead of simply telling him to visit the grave of Ḥusayn once, thus mocking him and making him regret his actions. Their narrations go on expounding the superiority of visiting the grave of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the other Imāms over the fifth pillar of Islam (Hajj to the House of Allah).

The contents of these narrations makes one believe that their inventor uttered them without being in his senses, or he was a totally bigoted disbeliever. They cannot be surpassed as far as the extent to which they have strayed in this aspect is concerned. A person, after reading their narrations will be convinced that this is the religion of polytheists and not monotheist Muslims. All of these teachings are unheard of among Muslims. It is the teachings of their so-called scholars and Ayatollahs and certainly not the religion of the Rabb of the universe. Their source is not that which was revealed upon the leader of the Messengers but rather it is the guesswork and imaginations of their own men. A closer look at these narrations leaves one convinced that there was a definite motive behind them, i.e. changing the religion of the Muslims and turning them away from their Qiblah, the House of the Rabb of the universe.

This is the message that is presented in their narrations, in many different ways. The idea behind this repetition is to entrench this belief in the hearts of the simple-minded and the ignorant ones, as innovations are quickly accepted

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* 2/16, *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 10/348, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/38

by them.¹ Our observation can be understood from the following narration of theirs:

A villager from Yemen sets out to visit the grave of Ḥusayn—as stated in the narration. On the way, he meets who they refer to al-Ṣādiq (as Ja‘far ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Ṣādiq has nothing to do with them and their narrations), who asks him regarding the effects of visiting the grave of Ḥusayn. The villager replies:

إنه يرى البركة من ذلك في نفسه وأهله وأولاده وأمواله وقضاء حوائجه

He will see the blessings therefrom in himself, his family, his children, his wealth and when he fulfils his needs.

Abū ‘Abd Allāh then says (as their narration claims):

أفلا أزيدك من فضله فضلاً يا أبا اليمن؟

Should I not add a virtue to its virtues for you, O brother from Yemen?

The villager replies, “Increase me, O son of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ”

Then, the following took place:

إن زيارة أبي عبد الله عليه السلام تعدل حجة مقبولة زاكية مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وآله فتعجب من ذلك، فقال له: أي والله وحجتين مبرورتين متقبلتين زاكيتين مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، فتعجب، فلم يزل أبو عبد الله عليه السلام يزيد حتى قال: ثلاثين حجة مبرورة متقبلة زاكية مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

Abu ‘Abd Allāh said to him, “Visiting Abū ‘Abd Allāh (himself) is equal to a pure Ḥajj in the company of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ.”

1 It is for this reason that Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī would say, ‘It is from the good-fortune of a new-Muslim and a non-Arab that Allah guides them to a scholar from the Ahl al-Sunnah’. *Sharḥ Uṣūl I’tiqād Ahl al-Sunnah*.

Thereupon the villager expressed surprise so he added; “By the oath of Allah, it is equal to performing Ḥajj which is righteous, accepted and pure in the company of Rasūl Allah ﷺ twice.”

The villager was still surprised, so Abū ‘Abd Allāh kept adding to the numbers until he said, “Ḥajj which is righteous, accepted and pure in the company of Rasūl Allah ﷺ thirty times.”¹

Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq is alleged to have established in this strange manner, which is more like the talks of children, that visiting the graves is greater than performing Ḥajj thirty times. They even attribute these lies, in the same laughable manner, to Rasūl Allah ﷺ. However, in this case the words alone expose their lies, unlike the case of the Imām where it was only the meaning of the narrations. The narration states:

كان الحسين عليه السلام ذات يوم في حجر النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وهو يلعبه ويضاحكه، وإن عائشة قالت: يا رسول الله ما أشد إعجابك بهذا الصبي!! فقال لها: وكيف لا أحبه وأعجب به وهو ثمرة فؤادي وقرّة عيني، أما إن أمّتي ستقتله فمن زاره بعد وفاته كتب الله له حجة من حجّجي، قالت: يا رسول الله حجة من حجّجك؟! قال: نعم وحجّتين، قالت: حجّتين؟ قال: نعم وأربعاً. فلم تزل تزدده وهو يزيد حتى بلغ سبعين حجة من حجّج رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بأعمارهم

Ḥusayn عليه السلام was once on the lap of Rasūl Allah ﷺ who was playing and laughing with him. ‘Ā’ishah said, ‘O Rasūl Allah, your amazement with this child is indeed immense.’

He replied to her saying, “How can I not be amazed with him and love him when he is the fruit of my heart and the coolness of my eyes? Listen! My ummah will kill him. So, whoever visits him after his death, Allah will write for him a Ḥajj from my Ḥajj.”

She said, “O Rasūl Allah, a Ḥajj from your Ḥajj?”

1 Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī: *Thawāb al-A‘māl* pg. 52, Al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī: *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 10/350-351

He replied, “Yes, two Ḥajj.”

She asked ‘Two Ḥajj?’

He answered, “Yes, four.”

She continued to add and he increased until it reached seventy Ḥajj from the Ḥajj of Rasūl Allah ﷺ along with their ‘Umrahs.¹

Another narration states:

من زار قبر أبي عبد الله كتب الله له ثمانين حجة مبرورة

Allah will record eighty accepted Ḥajj for the one who visits the grave of Abū ‘Abd Allāh.²

Another narration surpasses this and states:

من أتى قبر الحسين عليه السلام عارفًا بحقه كان كمن حجّ مائة حجة مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

Whoever visits the grave of Ḥusayn, understanding his rights, he is like one who performed Ḥajj a hundred times with Rasūl Allah ﷺ.³

One hundred is only the entry level for these fabricators. The other narrations run in the thousands. When that too is not enough, they add on a variety of other rewards, as if the religion is only about gallivanting to graves and standing by them. *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* (as well as other books) report that Abū Ja’far said to Muḥammad ibn Muslim:

لو يعلم الناس ما في زيارة الحسين عليه السلام من الفضل لماتوا شوقًا، وتقطعت أنفسهم عليه حسرات،

1 *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 10/351-352

2 *Thawāb al-A’māl* pg. 52, *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* pg. 162, *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 10/350

3 *Thawāb al-A’māl* pg. 52, *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 10/350

If people knew what is (achieved) in the visitation of Ḥusayn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام، they would die out of enthusiasm and their souls would shred to pieces in regret.

Muḥammad ibn Muslim asked:

وما فيه؟

And what is in it?

Abū Ja'far replied:

قال: من زاره تشوقاً إليه كتب الله له ألف حجة متقبلة، وألف عمرة مبرورة، وأجر ألف شهيد من شهداء بدر، وأجر ألف صائم، وثواب ألف صدقة مقبولة، وثواب ألف نسمة أريد بها وجه الله، ولم يزل محفوظاً سنته من كل آفة أهونها الشيطان، ووكل به ملك كريم يحفظه من بين يديه ومن خلفه وعن يمينه وعن شماله ومن فوق رأسه ومن تحت قدمه، فإن مات سنته حضرته ملائكة الرحمن يحضرون غسله وأكفانه والاستغفار له ويشيئونه إلى قبره بالاستغفار له، ويفسح له في قبره مدّ بصره، ويؤمنه الله من ضغطة القبر، ومن منكر ونكير يروعانه، ويفتح له باب إلى الجنة، ويعطى كتابه بيمينه ويعطى له يوم القيامة نور يضيء لنوره ما بين المشرق والمغرب، وينادي مناد هذا من زار الحسين شوقاً إليه، فلا يبقى أحد يوم القيامة إلا تمنى يومئذ أنه كان من زوّار الحسين عليه السّلام

Whoever visits him with enthusiasm towards him, Allah will record for him a thousand accepted Ḥajj, a thousand virtuous 'Umrah, the reward of a thousand martyrs like the martyrs of Badr, the reward of a thousand fasting people, the reward of a thousand accepted charities, a thousand souls which were only intended for Allah, he will be protected from every calamity for a year, the least of them being Shayṭān. And a noble angel will be appointed to protect him from his front, back, right, left, above his head and below his feet.

If he dies in that year, the angels of al-Raḥmān will present themselves before him; they will witness the washing (of his body), the shrouding (of his body in burial-cloths), the forgiveness that is sought for him and they will accompany him to his grave whilst seeking forgiveness for him. They

will widen his grave as far as his eyes can see, save him from the squeezing of the grave and from Munkar and Nakīr (who would have otherwise) scared him and the door of heaven will be opened for him. He will be given his book in the right hand. He will be given light on the Day of Judgment that will shine from the east to the west and an announcer will announce, 'This is the one who visited Ḥusayn out of enthusiasm for him.' There will be no person on the Day of Judgment, except that he will wish that he was from those who visited Ḥusayn.¹

Another narration recounts the rewards of visiting his grave:

إن الرجل منكم ليغتسل في الفرات ثم يأتي قبر الحسين عارفاً بحقه فيعطيه الله بكل قدم يرفعها أو يضعها مائة حجة مقبولة، ومائة عمرة مبرورة، مائة غزوة مع نبي مرسل أو إمام عادل

A man amongst you who takes a bath in the Euphrates and then comes to the grave of Ḥusayn, understanding his rights; Allah will grant him in return for every time that he raised or dropped his foot, one hundred accepted Ḥajj, one hundred righteous 'Umrah, and a hundred campaigns under a Nabī who was sent or a just Imām.²

A third narration states:

من زار الحسين عليه السلام يوم عاشوراء حتى يظل عنده باكياً لقي الله عز وجل يوم القيامة بثواب ألفي حجة، وألفي ألف عمرة، وألفي ألف غزوة، وثواب كل حجة وعمرة وغزوة كثواب من حج واعتمر وغزا مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ومع الأئمة الراشدين صلوات الله عليهم

Whoever visits Ḥusayn on the day of 'Āshūrā and stays by him until he cries will meet Allah on the Day on Judgment with the reward of two million Ḥajj, two million 'Umrah, and two million campaigns. The reward of each of (these) Ḥajj, 'Umrah and campaigns is equivalent to the (reward) of one who did Ḥajj, 'Umrah and went out on a campaign with Rasūl Allah ﷺ and the guided Imāms.³

1 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 1/353, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/18

2 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 10/379, *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* pg. 185

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/290, *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* pg. 176

The narration goes on to mention that this reward will also be accrued by one who could not visit his grave on this day as long as he climbs on the roof of his house and greets him by gesture, curses his killers, wails and cries for him and he does not go out on that day for any of his needs. Narrations of this type are found in abundance in their books. Quoting all of them will waste a lot of our resources and sicken our hearts, as they are narrations which are aimed at turning people away from worshipping the Allah—the Majestic—to worshipping the creation, who are themselves in need.

The ultimate goal of these narrations is to drive people towards discarding and forsaking the laws and teachings of Islam. Unimaginable rewards are kept in merely moving ones feet in the direction of a certain grave. Why then, will a person not believe that contravening all the prohibitions will not affect him? It is obvious that he will take his crimes very lightly and he will eventually turn away completely from the commands of Allah.

If there was any truth to these promises, the Noble Qur'ān would have definitely mentioned it in some way or the other. Is it not strange that the Qur'ān clearly mentions Ḥajj but makes absolutely no mention of visiting the graves, whereas, according to them, visiting the grave holds much more virtue? This was picked up by one of the Shī'ah who could not understand why visiting the grave of Ḥusayn عليه السلام held so much of virtue, to the extent that it exceeded the rewards of Ḥajj manifold, even though it was not mentioned in the Qur'ān (which is a sign that indicates the falseness of narrations). Hence, after hearing about these rewards from the Imām, he asked:

قد فرض الله على الناس حج البيت، ولم يذكر زيارة قبر الحسين عليه السلام

(Why is it) that Allah made Ḥajj of the House compulsory upon the people, but did not mention the visiting of Husain's عليه السلام grave?

The Imām replied (in a most imprecise manner):

وإن كان كذلك فإن هذا شيء جعله الله هكذا

Since it is like that, this is a matter that Allah has made like this.¹

They have confessed that the Qur’ān is free of any such nonsense, despite the fact that they are the masters of ‘hidden interpretations’. This is sufficient a proof to debunk all that their books contain on the subject, as there is no greater proof than a confession. They destroyed their home with their own hands! It is as if the Imām said, “I have no answer for this. The matter is like that. Allah did not explain to His slaves the manner and guidelines of worshipping Him.”

After presenting his imprecise answer, he wishes to redeem himself by giving an answer that is not even remotely related to the question. He said:

أما سمعت قول أمير المؤمنين: إن باطن القدم أحق بالمسح من ظاهر القدم، ولكن الله فرض هذا على العباد

Did you not hear the statement of Amīr al-Mu’minīn, “The bottom of the foot² is more deserving of being wiped than the top of the foot, but Allah ordained this (wiping of the top of foot) upon the slaves.”³

Here, they are confessing that visiting the graves is like the bottom of the foot, i.e. it is not among that which was commanded by Allah. Thereafter, he continues with his meaningless speech:

أوما علمت أن الموقف لو كان في الحرم كان أفضل لأجل الحرم ولكن الله صنع ذلك في غير الحرم

Do you not know that if the place of standing (at ‘Arafāt) was in the Ḥaram, it would have been better, on account of the Ḥaram? However, Allah placed it away from the Ḥaram.⁴

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/33, *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* pg. 266

2 The more accurate version of the statement of ‘Alī عليه السلام is ‘the bottom of the leather sock’.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/33, *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* pg. 266

4 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/33, *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* pg. 266

This is another confession that visiting the graves was not made compulsory, even though this sect believes that it holds a greater position. Furthermore, in their attempt to present an excuse, they consider themselves in a position to pass comments regarding the decisions of Allah. They hint that Allah did not do that which was more appropriate and correct (Allah is way above all that which the foolish say), as He did not place 'Arafāt inside the Ḥaram. In this way, the bigoted sect, who fabricated narrations to fool the ignorant, have puked out the negativity that was hidden in them regarding the law and wisdom of Allah, and they have portrayed themselves as advisors regarding His matters.

As stated before, their narrations on this subject are abundant. I have before me a huge amount of this filth, which will boggle the mind of one who has not been polluted with these tales. There are so many narrations that I cannot decide as to which ones I should take and which ones I should leave. Each one of them contains such statements that will shock and disturb one who has the slightest relationship with the Book of Allah, or the slightest amount of concern for his religion. They are only acceptable to those who have shackled their brains in their fanaticism and desires and those who take pride in doing evil simply to promote their sect and stance.

If only the Shī'ah could pause for a moment, remove themselves from subservience to these narrations and ponder with impartiality regarding these narrations which take them into the abyss of shirk! They are made to forget their Rabb and instead hold onto the grave of one of the creation, who cannot even decide regarding his own benefit, harm, life and resurrection. Allah says:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ تَدْعُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ عِبَادٌ أَمْثَلُكُمْ

Indeed, those you [polytheists] call upon besides Allah are servants [i.e., creations] like you.

Another surprising matter related to the subject is that when a narration appeared to contradict these lies which emphasise the superiority of this innovation over

Ḥajj to the sanctified House of Allah, al-Majlisī (the distinguished scholar of the Shī'ah) rejected this, practicing upon Taqiyyah. One narration states:

عن حنان قلت لأبي عبد الله عليه السلام: ما تقول في زيارة قبر الحسين صلوات الله عليه فإنه بلغنا عن بعضكم أنه قال: تعدل حجة وعمره؟ قال فقال: ما أضعف هذا الحديث ما تعدل هذا كله ولكن زوروه ولا تجفوه فإنه سيد شباب أهل الجنة

Ḥannān says, "I asked Abū 'Abd Allāh عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, 'What do you say regarding visiting the grave of Ḥusayn, as it has reached us from one of you that he said, 'It is equal to Ḥajj and 'Umrah'?"

He replied, "This narration is extremely weak. It is not equal to all of that. They have forged this. However, do not become indifferent towards him as he is the leader of the youth of Jannah."¹

Al Majlisī explains in his interpretation of this text, which demolishes the stack of narrations quoted by him and exposes the deviance that his people hold onto:

لعل المراد أنها لا تعدل الواجبين من الحج والعمرة والأظهر أنه محمول على التقية

Perhaps it means that it is not equal to the obligatory Ḥajj and 'Umrah, but the more likely possibility is that it should be taken as Taqiyyah.²

In other words, Imām Ja'far lied to please the Ahl al-Sunnah, or out of fear for them, but his statement (without any interpretation) has no place in the Shī'ī religion. This is what the Rāfiḍah do to all the narrations of the Ahl al-Bayt, which do not suit their agenda; they render them meaningless by means of the ever-ready excuse of Taqiyyah. The result of this is that Shī'ism has turned into a religion based totally on the desires of their so-called scholars, and it has nothing to do with the Ahl al-Bayt.

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 101/35, *Qurb al-Isnād* pg. 48

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 101/35, *Qurb al-Isnād* pg. 48

Visiting Karbalā' on the Day of 'Arafāh is greater than visiting it on any other day

Among the strong indications that these narrations were forged with the purpose of turning the Muslims away from the House of their Rabb, causing disunity among them, jeopardising their matters and causing them to turn away from one another (on account of this annual get-together) is that visiting on the Day of 'Arafāh is given special virtue . They say:

من أتى قبر الحسين عارفاً بحقه في غير يوم عيد كتب الله له عشرين حجة وعشرين عمرة مبرورات مقبولات.. ومن أتاه في يوم عيد كتب الله له مائة حجة ومائة عمرة.. ومن أتاه يوم عرفة عارفاً بحقه كتب الله له ألف حجة وألف عمرة مبرورات متقبّلات، وألف غزوة مع نبي مرسل أو إمام عادل

Whoever visits the grave of Ḥusayn on a day other than the day of 'Īd, Allah will record for him twenty accepted and virtuous Ḥajj and 'Umrah... Whoever visits him on the day of 'Īd, Allah will record for him one hundred Ḥajj and 'Umrah. Whoever visits him on the day of 'Arafāh, knowing his rights, Allah will record a thousand accepted and virtuous Ḥajj, 'Umrah and a thousand campaigns with a sent Nabī or a just Imām.¹

Some of their narrations have explicit mention of the ultimate goal. Ja'far al-Sādiq said (according to their slander):

لو أتى حدّثكم بفضل زيارته وبفضل قبره لتركتم الحجّ رأساً وما حجّ منكم أحد، ويحك أما علمت أنّ الله اتخذ كربلاء حرماً آمناً مباركاً قبل أن يتخذ مكة حرماً

If I were to tell you the virtues of visiting him and the virtues of his grave, you would have left Ḥajj completely, and none of you would have performed Ḥajj. Woe unto you, do you not know that Allah made Karbalā' a sanctified peaceful and blessed land even before he made Makkah a sanctified place...²

1 Al-Kulaynī: *Furū' al-Kāfi* 1/324, Ibn Bābuwayh: *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* 1/182, al-Tūsī: *Al-Tahdhīb* 2/16, Ibn Qūlawayh: *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* pg. 169, *Thawāb al-A'māl* pg. 50, al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī: *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 10/359

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/33, *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* pg. 266

Did you not see how he (the forger of the narration) subtly indicated that it is preferable to abandon the command of Ḥajj and to head to Karbalā' instead? He also says:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَبْدَأُ بِالنَّظَرِ إِلَى زَوَارِ قَبْرِ الْحُسَيْنِ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ عَشِيَّةَ عَرَفَةَ قَبْلَ نَظَرِهِ إِلَى أَهْلِ الْمَوْقِفِ

Allah begins by looking at the visitors of the grave of Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī on the evening of 'Arafāh, even before looking at the people of 'Arafāh.

The narrator asked him regarding the reason behind this. He replied:

لَأَنَّ فِي أَوْلَئِكَ أَوْلَادَ زَنَّا وَلَيْسَ فِي هَؤُلَاءِ أَوْلَادَ زَنَّا

Because there are illegitimates among those and there are no illegitimates among these.¹

Illegitimates, according to the Shī'ah, refer to non-Shī'ahs.²

1 Al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī: *Al-Wāfi* vol. 2, 8/222

2 Proof of this is the statement attributed to Abū Ja'far in *al-Kāfi*. He said (as they allege):

وَاللَّهُ إِنَّ النَّاسَ كُلَّهُمْ أَوْلَادُ بَغَايَا مَا خَلَّالَ شِيعَتِنَا

By Allah, people are all sons prostitutes, besides our Shī'ah.

Al-Kulaynī: *al-Rawḍah min al-Kāfi* pg. 135 (Lukhnow print 1996). Refer to *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/311

Ibrāhīm ibn Abī Yaḥyā relates that Ja'far ibn Muḥammad said:

مَا مِنْ مَوْلُودٍ يُولَدُ إِلَّا وَإِبْلِيسَ مِنَ الْإِبَالِسَةِ بِحَضْرَتِهِ، فَإِنْ عَلِمَ اللَّهُ أَنَّ الْمَوْلُودَ مِنْ شِيعَتِنَا حَاجِبِهِ مِنْ ذَلِكَ الشَّيْطَانِ، وَإِنْ لَمْ يَكُنِ الْمَوْلُودُ مِنْ شِيعَتِنَا أَثَبَتَ

الشَّيْطَانُ إصْبَعَهُ فِي دُبُرِ الْغُلَامِ فَكَانَ مَأْبُوءًا، وَفِي فَرْجِ الْجَارِيَةِ فَكَانَتْ فَاجِرَةً

Not a single child is born except that one of the senior devils are present by him. If Allah knows that the child will be from our Shī'ah, He veils him from that devil. If he is not from our Shī'ah, the devil inserts his finger into the backside of the boy, causing him to become a sissy, and into the private part of the girl, causing her to become an evil doer.

Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī 2/218, *al-Burhān* 2/139.

Al-Majlisī dedicated a chapter to this subject in his *Biḥār*, under the title, 'People will be called by the names of their mothers, except the Shī'ah'. He quotes twelve narrations in this chapter. *Biḥār al-Anwār* 7/237. Refer to *Tafsīr Nūr al-Thaqalayn* 2/513 as well.

It seems as if the objective behind these narrations was attained, at least in some cases. One of the narrators of these tales, after hearing the supplication that Imām Ja'far made on behalf of those who visit the grave of Ḥusayn said:

والله لقد تمنيت أني زرتہ ولم أحج

By Allah, I really wish I had visited him instead of doing Ḥajj.¹

Another narration states:

أن يتنفل بالحج والعمرة فمنعه من ذلك شغل دنيا أو عائق فأتى الحسين بن علي في يوم عرفة أجزأه ذلك من أداء حجته وضاعف الله له بذلك أضعافاً مضاعفة (قال الراوي): قلت: كم تعدل حجة وكم تعدل عمرة؟ قال: لا يحصى ذلك. قلت: مائة. قال: ومن يحصى ذلك؟ قلت: ألف. قال: وأكثر، ثم قال: وإن تعدوا نعمة الله لا تحصوها

Whoever wishes to perform optional Ḥajj or 'Umrah, but he is held back due to involvement in worldly occupations or difficulties, and thus goes to Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī on the Day of 'Arafāh, it will be sufficient for him (as far as performing his Ḥajj is concerned) and Allah will multiply (his reward) manifold on account of that.

I (the narrator) asked, "How many Ḥajj and 'Umrah will it be equal to?"

He replied, "That cannot be counted."

I asked, "A hundred?"

He replied, "Who can count that?"

I asked, "A thousand?"

He replied, "Even more."

Then, he added, "If you count the bounty of Allah, you will not encompass it."²

1 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 10/321, *Furū' al-Kāfi* 335, *Thawāb al-A'māl* pg. 35

2 *Al-Wāfi* vol. 2, 8/223

As you may have realised, the beginning of this narration indicates that Ḥajj holds more virtue than visiting the grave of Ḥusayn, which only serves as compensation. The same text does not end until this is reversed! Their scholar, al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī comments on the narrations which state the merits of visiting the grave of Ḥusayn saying:

إن هذا ليس بكثير على من جعله الله إمامًا للمؤمنين، وله خلق السماوات والأرضين، وجعله صراطه وسبيله، وعينه، ودليله، وبابه الذي يؤتى منه، وجبله المتصل بينه وبين عبادته من رسل وأنبياء وحجج وأولياء، هذا مع أن مقابرهم رضي الله عنهم فيها أيضًا إنفاق أموال، ورجاء آمال، وإشخاص أبدان، وهجران أوطان، وتحمل مشاق، وتجديد ميثاق، وشهود شعائر، وحضور مشاعر

This is not a lot upon the one who Allah made the Imām of the believers, for whom he created the heavens and the earths, whom he made his road, path, eye, guide, the door from which he is approached and His rope which connects him to His messengers, Ambiyā’ Ḥujjahs, and friends from the creation. This is despite the reality that (for) their graves money is spent, bodies are presented, hometowns are left, difficulties are undertaken, promises are renewed, the great signs are witnessed and rituals are performed.¹

Ponder over this extremism! Ḥusayn is made the rope and intermediary between Allah and His creation. He is even named the ‘eye and door to Allah’. Look at how he tries to establish the virtues of visiting the grave of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ by citing such actions which are from the very pathways to shirk such as; undertaking a special journey to the grave, spending money for or at the grave whilst seeking intercession, pinning hopes upon it and all the other pathways to shirk. Despite all the shirk in this ritual, it is considered by them to be the best action.²

1 Al-Wāfi vol. 2, 8/223

2 One wonders, when this is what their narrations state, then why is it that their scholars have not practiced upon them. Why have they not abandoned Ḥajj? One possible reason is that they wish to be present at the largest gathering in the world in order to spread their baseless ideas among all other Muslims. Another reason is that they fear criticism from the Muslims, which would then spoil their opportunities to carry out their efforts in calling towards their cult (an act that they take as an obligation). The reality is that these narrations remove from a person’s heart any desire that might have been there to visit the House of Allah.

Visiting the grave of Ḥusayn is the best action

Visiting the grave of Ḥusayn عليه السلام is not only better than Ḥajj according to this sect, rather; it is the most virtuous act. Their narrations state that it is:

أفضل ما يكون من الأعمال

The best of actions.¹

Another narration states:

من أحب الأعمال زيارة قبر الحسين

From the most beloved actions is the visitation of the grave of Ḥusayn.²

Al-Majlisī dedicated an entire chapter to this, in which he has quoted narrations of this nature.³ It is in this manner that the directives and laws of Islam are forgotten. They devote themselves to shrines and graves and consider this to be the best of actions without any proof, except that which their imaginations concoct and their devils reveal. As a result, they sculpt a religion which has nothing to do with Allah.

Karbalā' is greater than the Ka'bah

The Qiblah of the Muslims and the most honourable and virtuous land of the Muslims is the sanctified House of Allah. It is the only place around which *Ṭawāf* (circumambulation) is mandatory. It is that piece of land that Allah made a place of return and security. Muslims gather annually on this blessed land, and all the Muslims face its direction. However, the narrations of the Shī'ah have a different message. They state that this blessed land is nothing more than a humiliated and valueless tail of Karbalā'.⁴

1 *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* pg. 146, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 49/101

2 *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* pg. 146, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 49/101

3 The name of the chapter is, 'Visiting his grave is the best of actions'. *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/49

4 The exact text will appear along with the reference.

The motive behind these tales is obvious. The annual gathering of the Muslims in these pure lands robs the enemies of their peaceful sleep. Their eyes are hurt by the sight of so many Muslims in one place. Thus, they have exhausted all their resources and tried in every possible manner to turn the hearts of the Muslims away from these places. The ready-made path to this was Shī'ism. Thus, they said, "The grave of Ḥusayn is greater than the Ka'bah, the sanctified House." Thereafter, they concocted narrations and falsely attributed them to members of the Ahl al-Bayt to prove that their belief does have some basis. In this way they hoped to get their idea into the hearts of the inattentive ones, the ignorant, those who follow their desires, the innovators, bigots, disgruntled ones and those seeking to cause disunity and mayhem in the ummah.

The Shī'ah consider Karbalā' and the other cities in which the graves of their Imāms are situated (as they claim) to be holy and sanctified cities. Thus, Kūfah, Qum, and the other cities are all regarded as sanctified places. One narration states:

إِنَّ الكوفة حرم الله وحرم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم حرم أمير المؤمنين، وإنَّ الصَّلَاةَ فيها بألف صلاة والذَّهرم بألف درهم

Kūfah is the Ḥaram (sanctified area) of Allah, His Rasūl, and Amīr al-Mu'minīn. Ṣalāh in it is equal to a thousand ṣalāh and a dirham spent there is equivalent to a thousand dirhams.¹

They report from Ja'far al-Ṣadiq:

إِنَّ لله حرماً هو مكّة، ولرسوله حرماً وهو المدينة، ولأمرير المؤمنين حرماً وهو الكوفة، ولنا حرماً وهو قم ستدفن فيه امرأة من ولدي تسمى فاطمة، من زارها وجبت له الجنة

Allah has a Ḥaram, which is Makkah; His Rasūl has a Ḥaram, which is Madīnah; Amīr al-Mu'minīn has Ḥaram, which is Kūfah and we have a Ḥaram, which is Qum. A woman from my offspring, by the name of Fāṭimah

1 Al-Wāfi vol. 2, 8/215

will be buried there. Whoever visits her, Jannah will become compulsory for him.¹

‘Alī ibn Ḥasan (as they allege) said:

اتَّخَذَ اللَّهُ أَرْضَ كَرْبَلَاءَ حَرَمًا آمِنًا مَبَارَكًا قَبْلَ أَنْ يَخْلُقَ اللَّهُ أَرْضَ الْكَعْبَةِ وَيَتَّخِذَهَا حَرَمًا بِأَرْبَعَةِ وَعَشْرِينَ
أَلْفَ عَامٍ، وَقَدَّسَهَا وَبَارَكَ عَلَيْهَا، فَمَا زَالَتْ قَبْلَ خَلْقِ اللَّهِ الْخَلْقَ مَقْدَسَةً مَبَارَكَةً وَلَا تَزَالُ كَذَلِكَ حَتَّى
يَجْعَلَهَا اللَّهُ أَفْضَلَ أَرْضٍ فِي الْجَنَّةِ، وَأَفْضَلَ مَنْزِلٍ وَمَسْكَنٍ يَسْكُنُ فِيهِ أَوْلِيَائِهِ فِي الْجَنَّةِ

Allah made Karbalā’ sanctified, secure, and blessed land twenty four thousand years before he created the land of the Ka’bah and sanctified it. He made it sacred and blessed. It remained sacred and blessed, even before Allah created the creation, and it will remain like that until Allah makes it the best land in Jannah, and it will be the best place and house in which his friends will stay when in Jannah.²

Karbalā’ is revered as it has in it the body of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. The question now arises; was Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ buried twenty four thousand years before the creation of the Ka’bah? Another question is; why is Madīnah not given this merit, as it contains the blessed body of Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ? Indeed, this is an open contradiction which pulls the carpet from under their feet. It reveals that the motive and goal of these narrations is not to revere Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, but rather to plot against the ummah and their religion.

There are many narrations in their books which grant superiority to Karbalā’ over the House of Allah. Amongst their tales is a conversation that took place between Karbalā’ and the Ka’bah. Besides the irreligious contents of this tale, it even reflects their lack of any intelligence. They attribute to Ja’far al-Ṣādiq:

1 A famous city in Iran. All the inhabitants of this city belong to the Twelver Shī’ah. Refer to *Mu’jam al-Buldān* 4/397. The reason why they revere the city is because the daughter of the seventh Imām, Fāṭimah bint Mūsā is buried there. Refer to ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ḥusaynī: *Mashāhid al-’Itrah* pg. 62.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/107

إن أرض الكعبة قالت: من مثلي وقد بني بيت الله على ظهري يأتيني الناس من كل فجر عميق وجعلت حرم الله وأمنه. فأوحى الله أن كفي وقري ما فضل ما فضلت به فيما أعطيت أرض كربلاء إلا بمنزلة الإبرة غرست في البحر فحملت من ماء البحر، ولولا تربة كربلاء ما فضلتك، ولولا من تضمنه أرض كربلاء ما خلقتك ولا خلقت البيت الذي به افتخرت، فقري واستقري وكوني ذنبًا متواضعًا ذليلاً مهينًا غير مستكبر ولا مستكبر لأرض كربلاء وإلا سخت بك وهويت بك في نار جهنم

The land of the Ka'bah said, "Who is like me? The House of Allah was built upon me. People come to me from every nook and corner and I was made the Ḥaram of Allah and His secure land."

Thereupon, Allah revealed to it, "Stop and calm down. The merit that you have been given in comparison to that which Karbalā' has been accorded, is like a needle that was dipped in the ocean and carried some of its water. Had it not been for the sand of Karbalā', I would not have granted any merit to you. If it was not for that which the land of Karbalā' contains, I would not have created you or the house on the basis of which you are being proud, so calm down and be a humiliated and valueless tail without any haughtiness or pride for the land of Karbalā', otherwise I will become angry with you and fling you into the fire of Jahannam."¹

The Ka'bah (as they claim) did not take heed to this advice. It did not express humility before the land of the Ka'bah by becoming the humiliated and valueless tail. Thus, the punishment descended upon it. In fact, every place and all the waters of the world, besides Karbalā' received this punishment. Their narrations state:

فما من ماء ولا أرض إلا عوقبت لترك التواضع لله، حتى سلط الله على الكعبة المشركين، وأرسل إلى زمزم ماء مالحًا حتى أفسد طعمه

There is no land or water, except that it was punished for not having humility before Allah. Allah gave the polytheists power over the Ka'bah and he sent salty water to Zam Zam, which gave it a bad taste.²

1 Kāmil al-Ziyārāt pg. 270, Biḥār al-Anwār 101/109

2 Kāmil al-Ziyārāt pg. 270, Biḥār al-Anwār 101/109

It is only Karbalā' that was saved from the punishment, even though it boastfully stated (as they imagine):

أنا أرض الله المقدسة المباركة، الشفاء في تربتي ومائي ولا فخر

I am the sacred and sanctified land of Allah. Cure lies in my soil and water and I have no pride.¹

This is only a portion of that which they claim regarding Karbalā'. Gathering and studying all of their narrations would require a separate volume. However, it would be an insult to the intellect to scrutinise these narrations as they have a greater resemblance to the blabbering of insane people as opposed to the speech of mentally balanced people. If I did not find it in their reliable books and in many of their narrations, I would have brushed it aside as something that is not established (in their religion). Undoubtedly, these narrations are a scathing attack against the Ahl al-Bayt, who they claim to love and support. They are in reality, more vicious towards them than the open enemies. The shamelessness contained herein is so severe that it leads a civilised Shī'ī (who reads it and wishes to believe it) towards the brink of deviation and atheism.

The fabricator of these tales failed miserably in his attempt to turn Muslims away from the Ka'bah, as the only people who are affected by these narrations and visit Karbalā' are those whose ears have been blocked from the truth and their eyes have been blinded from it on account of their fanaticism. The result is that they continue to dwell in the valleys of misguidance.

As long as the Book of Allah remains among the Muslims, they will never be affected by these plots. It is only those who abandon the Book of Allah, and instead take the word of the Ḥujjahs, Sayyids, Ayatollahs and that which his sect does—even though it has no proof from the Qur'ān—who will be affected. The one who narrates this tale from Ja'far al-Ṣādiq is a person by the name of Ṣafwān

1 *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* pg. 270, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/109

al-Jammāl. The Shī'ah declare him to be reliable.¹ He is the one who will bear the burden of these lies, if this chain is not another hallucination, as I did not find anyone by this name in the books of narrators of the Ahl al-Sunnah that I referred to.

The angels appear before the visitors of Ḥusayn and Allah has private conversations with them

The extremism of the Shī'ah as far as their narrations concerning the merits of visiting the grave of Ḥusayn عليه السلام surpassed all imaginable limits. The intelligence is stunned upon seeing the extent to which they went. Imam Ja'far is alleged to have said:

من خرج من منزله يريد زيارة الحسين كتب الله له بكل خطوة حسنة... إلى أن قال: وإذا قضى مناسكه.. أتاه ملك فقال له: أنا رسول الله، ربك يقرئك السلام ويقول لك: استأنف فقد غفر لك ما مضى

Whoever leaves his home with the desire to visit Ḥusayn, Allah records for him a good deed upon every step...When he completes his rites, an angel appears before him and says, "I am the messenger of Allah, your Rabb. He is sending greetings to you and saying to you, 'Start afresh, as he has forgiven whatever passed.'"²

The angels meet the visitors of the grave, convey to them the greetings of Allah and distribute among them certificates of forgiveness. This claim surpasses the speech of the insane by a few levels. Much worse is the following claim:

فإذا أتاه (يعني أتى الزائر قبر الحسين) ناجاه الله فقال: عبي، سلمي أعطك، ادعني أجبك

When he (the visitor of the grave of Ḥusayn) comes to him, Allah personally converses with him saying, "My slave, ask me, I will grant you. Call out to me, I will answer."³

1 *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* 9/121

2 *Al-Ṭūsī: Tahdhīb Al-Tahdhīb* 2/14, Ibn Qūlawayh: *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* pg. 132, *Thawāb al-A'māl* pg. 51, *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 10/341-342

3 *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* pg. 132, *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 10/342, *Thawāb al-A'māl* pg. 51

In this way, they attribute lies to Allah, an act which can only be carried out by one who does not believe in Allah at all. This is their claim despite the fact that they have adopted the viewpoint of those who do not believe in the attributes of Allah regarding the speech of Allah. “Allah personally speaks to the visitors of Ḥusayn.” Most certainly, this is a dangerous lie and a great slander!

As usual, they were not satisfied with the degree of their extremism. They go on to claim that Allah (who is far beyond all the claims of the evil ones) himself visits the graves of the Imāms, along with the Shī'ah. *Al-Biḥār* of al-Majlisī states:

إِنَّ قَبْرَ أَمِيرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ يَزُورُهُ اللَّهُ مَعَ الْمَلَائِكَةِ وَيَزُورُهُ الْأَنْبِيَاءُ وَيَزُورُهُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ

Allah visits the grave of Amīr al-Mu'minīn along with the angels. The Ambiyā' as well as the believers also visit it.¹

Heinous indeed is that which comes out of their mouths and is written by their pens. They say nothing but lies.

The rites of the graves

Visiting the graves is among the obligations of their religion.² The one who leaves it out is considered a disbeliever (kāfir).³ Al-Majlisī dedicated a chapter thus titled, ‘the chapter (proving that) visiting him⁴ is obligatory, compulsory and it has been commanded and the criticism, reproach and warning that is narrated

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 100/258

2 Refer to the narrations of *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* of al-Ṭūsī 2/14, *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* of Ibn Qūlawayh pg. 194, *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* of al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī 10/333-337.

3 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* narrates from Hārūn ibn Khārījāh who asked Abū 'Abd Allah:

سألتهم عن ترك الزيارة زيارة قبر الحسين عليه السلام من غير علة، فقال: هذا رجل من أهل النار

I asked him regarding one who leaves out visiting the grave of Ḥusayn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام without any excuse. He replied, “This is a man from the people of the fire.”

Wasā'il al-Shī'ah 10/336-337, *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* pg. 193

4 i.e. Ḥusayn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام

for its abandoning. In this chapter, he quotes forty of their narrations.¹ This is the starting point. It is followed by their stipulation of rites like the rites carried out during Ḥajj. Ibn Taymiyyah says:

Their scholar, Ibn al-Nu'mān—more well-known as al-Mufīd by them—authored a book titled, *Manāsik al-Mashāhid*, in which he made the graves of the creation places around which Ṭawāf is performed just as it is performed around the Ka'bah which Allah made as a place of support for the people. It is the first house that was placed for people. Hence it is the only place around which Ṭawāf is performed, the only place towards which ṣalāh should be performed and the only place which is travelled to for Ḥajj (by divine command).²

However, in this day and age, their scholar, Āghā Buzurg al-Ṭahrānī has revealed to us in his book, *Kitāb Al-Dharī'ah*, that the compilations that are exclusively regarding the graves and their rites are no less than sixty in number.³ All of these books were written to lay the foundations of shirk that was to follow. Besides these books, their reliable books of narrations have specific chapters dedicated to the subject, as will be expounded upon. Below, we present to you some of the rites:

i. Performing Ṭawāf around graves

Ibn Taymiyyah says:

There is consensus among the Muslims that Ṭawāf does not take place around anything besides the Ka'bah.⁴ The scholars of the Shī'ah on the other hand, have ordained for their followers Ṭawāf around the graves of the deceased Imāms. To support this shirk, they fabricated narrations in

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/1-11

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/175, *Majmū' al-Fatāwā* 17/498

3 Refer to *Al-Dharī'ah* 20/316-326

4 *Majmū' Fatāwā* 4/521

the names of the Ahl al-Bayt. Al-Majlisī states that in one of (the narrations regarding) visitation of some of the Imāms, it is stated, “Except that we perform Ṭawāf around your tombs,” and in other narrations it is stated, “Kissed the sides of the grave.” He also states that al-Riḍā (according to his beliefs) would perform Ṭawāf around the grave of Rasūl Allah ﷺ.¹

He established these polytheistic rites in his religion from texts like the one quoted above. He did not look at the explicit and categorical texts in the Book of Allah which prohibit polytheism and promise that the Fire of Jahannam will be the ghastly abode of those who engage in it. Furthermore, he was confused by the contradictory narrations, as usual, which demolishes their view on these aspects. Since these narrations are also reported from the Imāms, he resorts to interpreting them differently.

Some of their narrations prohibit doing Ṭawāf around the graves of the Imāms. They report from their Imām:

لا تشرب وأنت قائم ولا تطف بغير،.. فإن من فعل ذلك فلا يلومن إلا نفسه، ومن فعل شيئاً من ذلك لم يكن يفارقه إلا ما شاء الله

Do not drink whilst standing and do not do Ṭawāf of a grave... Whoever does so should not blame anyone besides himself and whoever does any of that, it will not leave him except for the period that Allah wishes.²

Al-Majlisī really put himself through trouble trying to get around this one. He says:

يحتمل أن يكون التهي عن الطواف بالعدد المخصوص الذي يُطاف بالبيت

It is possible that the specific number of Ṭawāfs which are performed around the Ka'bah is being prohibited.³

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 100/126

2 Ibn Bābuwayh pg. 283, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 100/126

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 100/126

Ponder over this act of al-Majlisī. Instead of attempting to comply with that which is in the Book of Allah, the practice of the Muslims and the narration of the Shī'ah which says, "Do not do Ṭawāf of a grave," by prohibiting his people from this innovation (in which lies his salvation as well as theirs), he chooses to interpret the text so that it does not go against this act of theirs. He simply had to accept this narration as it is and interpret the other narrations, as they are unestablished and they lead to misguidance and shirk. However, he chose to insist that his deviant cult-rite is established by further stating:

يَحْتَمِلُ أَنْ يَكُونَ الْمُرَادُ بِالطَّوَّافِ الْمُنْفِي هُنَا التَّغَوُّطُ

It is possible that the prohibition from Ṭawāf here refers to relieving oneself.¹

The religion of the Shī'ah is not that which is established from the Imāms. Rather, it is that which al-Majlisī establishes (as you have read). Similarly, the actions of the Shī'ah are an imitation of the actions of their scholars and not the actions of the Imāms. They turned away from the command of the Imām, who said, "Do not do Ṭawāf around a grave," just as they turned away from the commands of Allah, His Rasūl ﷺ and the consensus of the Muslims. Thus, they deviated from the straight path and led their people astray.

ii. Ṣalāh at the grave

It is from the rites of visiting the tombs that a person performs two or more units of ṣalāh at the graves of the Imāms. At times, they even take these graves as the Qiblah. The reward of each unit (rak'ah) surpasses that of hundreds of Ḥajj. One narration states:

الصَّلَاةُ فِي حَرَمِ الْحُسَيْنِ لَكَ بِكُلِّ رَكْعَةٍ تَرَكْعُهَا عِنْدَهُ كَثُوبٌ مِنْ حِجَّ أَلْفِ حِجَّةٍ، وَاعْتَمَرُ أَلْفِ عَمْرَةٍ، وَأَعْتَقَ أَلْفَ رَقَبَةٍ، وَكَأَنَّكَ وَقَفْتَ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ أَلْفَ أَلْفٍ مَرَّةٍ مَعَ نَبِيِّهِ مُرْسِلٍ

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 100/127

For each rak'ah that you perform in the Ḥaram of Ḥusayn, you will be granted the reward of one who carried out a thousand Ḥajj, a thousand 'Umrah, and it is as if one stood in the path of Allah a million times in the company of a Nabī who was sent.¹

This reward is not specific to the grave of Ḥusayn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. It applies to the graves of all the Imāms. *Al-Biḥār* states:

من زار الرضا أو واحداً من الأئمة فصلى عنده.. فإنه يكتب له... وله بكل خطوة مائة حجة، ومائة عمرة، وعق مائة رقبة في سبيل الله، وكتب له مائة حسنة، وحط عنه مائة سيئة

Whoever visits al-Riḍā² or one of the Imāms and performs ṣalāh at his grave side, he will be granted...³ and upon each step, he will receive one hundred Ḥajj, one hundred 'Umrah, freeing of one hundred slaves, one hundred good deeds, and one hundred sins will be wiped out.⁴

Ṣalāh at the grave is considered more virtuous than Ḥajj to the House of Allah. They prefer that which is akin to shirk over Tawḥīd. This is not surprising, as the polytheists have always claimed that their religion is superior to the religion of Allah, and that they are more guided than the believers. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ cursed those who perform ṣalāh at graves. He صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said:

لعنة الله على اليهود والنصارى اتخذوا قبور أنبيائهم مساجد

May Allah curse the Jews and Christians. They took the graves of their Ambiyā' as places of ṣalāh.⁵

1 *Al-Wāfi* vol.2, 8/234

2 The grave of 'Ali al-Riḍā is considered the most important place in Iran. It is the most revered place by the Shī'ah. It has a huge dome covered in gold. 'Abd Allah Fayyāḍ: *Mushāhadātī fī l-Irān* pg. 102. This is because the graves, looking after them, and performing rituals at them are from the core of their religion.

3 He mentions the same rewards as those mentioned in the previous narrations along with a few additions.

4 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 100/137-138

5 *Al-Bukhārī* (with *Faṭḥ al-Bārī*) 1/532, 3/200, 3/255, 6/294, 8/140, 10/277. The meaning of this ḥadīth is reported in *Muslim* (pg. 376-377), *Aḥmad* 1/218, 6/80, 84, 121, 146, 229, 252, 255, 275 and *al-Dāramī* 1/326 as well.

Al-Bukhārī and *Muslim* report that during the final illness of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, a church in Abyssinia was mentioned in his presence. It was praised for its beauty and pictures. Thereupon, he ﷺ said:

إن أولئك إذا مات فيهم الرجل الصالح بنوا على قبره مسجداً، وصوروا فيه تلك التصاوير، أولئك شرار
الخلق عند الله

When a pious person would pass away from these people, they would build a Masjid upon his grave and place in it those pictures. They are the worst of creation according to Allah.¹

This is not something that is a “Sunni view”. The same appears in the books of the Shī‘ah. However, as per their habit, the scholars of the Shī‘ah do away with it by way of interpretation.

iii. Prostrating at the graves

Among the rites of visiting the grave is prostrating towards it, rubbing ones cheeks on it, kissing the entrance, and speaking to the person inside until one runs out of breath, as they explain. *Al-Majlisī*, under the chapter, ‘That which is desirable to do at his grave’² mentions that the one who they refer to as the Shaykh al-Ṭā’ifāh says whilst describing the actions that are to be done on a Friday visit:

ثم تنكبّ على القبر وتقول: مولاي إمامي، مظلوم استعدى على ظالمه، التصّر، التصّر حتى ينقطع النفس

Then he will fall upon the grave (prostrate) and say, “My master, my Imām. I am oppressed. His oppressors have transgressed against me. Help! Help!” until his breath runs out.³

1 *Al-Bukhārī* 1/523, 3/208, *Muslim* 1/375-376, *Musnad Abī ‘Awānah* 1/400-410, *Aḥmad* 6/51, *al-Bayhaqī* 4/80

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 101/285

3 *Bihār al-Anwār* 101/285

In most of their discussions regarding these visitations, they emphasise prostrating upon the grave and supplicating to it during the visit and at the end of it. In Imām Ja‘far’s advice concerning the rites of visiting Ḥusayn عليه السلام (as they allege), they are commanded to fast for three days prior to their visit. This should be followed by bathing, wearing clean clothes, and performing two units of ṣalāh. Thereafter, he says:

فإذا أتيت الباب فقف خارج القبة، وأوم بطرفك نحو القبر وقل: يا مولاي يا أبا عبد الله يا ابن رسول الله
عبدك وابن عبدك وابن أمتك، الدليل بين يديك، المقصّر في علو قدرك، المعترف بحقك، جاءك مستجيرًا
بذمتك، قاصدًا إلى حرمك، متوجّهًا إلى مقامك - إلى أن قال: - ثم انكب على القبر وقل: يا مولاي أيتك
خائفًا فأمتي، وأيتك مستجيرًا فأجرني.. ثم انكب على القبر ثانية

When you reach the door, stand outside the dome, indicate with your eyes towards the grave and say, “O my master, O Abū ‘Abd Allāh, O son of Rasūlullāh, your slave, the son of your slave, the son of your slave-girl... the humiliated one before you, the one who falls short regarding your lofty status and the one who acknowledges your rights has come to you seeking your protection, heading towards your Ḥaram, going towards your place...” Then you should fall prostrate upon the grave and say, “O my master, I have come to you in a state of fear, so grant me safety, and I came to seeking protection so protect me...then fall prostrate upon the grave a second time...”¹

The narration continues to mention supplications that will be directed to the creation instead of Allah, along with humbling oneself at their graves in the same manner that one humbles himself before Allah. If this is not shirk, then what is shirk? Al-Mufīd said something similar to this:

فإذا أردت الخروج فانكب على القبر وقبله... ثم ارجع إلى مشهد الحسين وقل: السّلام عليك يا أبا عبد
الله، أنت لي جنة من العذاب

When you wish to exit, fall prostrate upon the grave and kiss it... then

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/257-261, ‘*An al-Mazār al-Kabīr* by Muḥammad al-Mash-hadī pg. 143-144

return to the grave of Ḥusayn and say, “Peace be upon you, O Ḥusayn, you are my shield from the punishment.”¹

Thus, in their religion, associating partners with Allah is from that which is recommended. Prostrating to the grave or towards the one inside it is termed by them as ‘*inkibāb*’. Then, they supplicate to one who has passed away and does not even have control over that which is beneficial or harmful for him as if they are supplicating to the Creator of the heavens and the earth, who has complete control over everything. Allah says:

وَمَنْ أَضَلُّ مِمَّن يَدْعُو مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ مَنْ لَا يَسْتَجِيبُ لَهُ إِلَى يَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ وَهُمْ عَنِ دُعَائِهِمْ غَافِلُونَ

And who is more astray than he who invokes besides Allah those who will not respond to him until the Day of Resurrection [i.e., never], and they, of their invocation, are unaware.²

They believe that this act of shirk is “the best act of worship and they bluff their followers into thinking that it makes compulsory the forgiveness of sins, entry into Jannah, salvation from the fire, shedding of evil deeds, raising of ranks, and acceptance of supplications.”³ This act also makes “compulsory a long life, protection of ones being and wealth, increase in sustenance, ease of difficulties, and fulfilment of needs.”⁴ Furthermore, it is “equal to Ḥajj, ‘Umrah, Jihād, and freeing slaves”,⁵ among the other imaginary virtues that they have attached to it. Who can now doubt that they add to the religion of Allah that which has absolutely no basis?

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/257-261, ‘*An al-Mazār al-Kabīr*’ pg. 154

2 *Sūrah al-Aḥqāf*: 5

3 This is a chapter-heading of *Biḥār al-Anwār*. The chapter contains 37 narrations to ‘prove’ this. 101/21-28

4 This is another chapter-heading of *Biḥār al-Anwār*. The chapter contains 17 narrations. 101/45-48

5 This is yet another chapter-heading of *Biḥār al-Anwār*. The chapter contains 84 narrations. 101/28-

They hold onto any acts of shirk, major or minor, even if they cannot find any proof from their books (which have so many acts of shirk that they do not need to go beyond them) to substantiate it. As an example, al-Majlisī says:

وَأَمَّا تَقْبِيلُ الْأَعْتَابِ فَمَنْ نَقَفَ عَلَى نَصِّ يَعْتَدُّ بِهِ وَلَكِنْ عَلَيْهِ الْإِمَامِيَّةُ

As for kissing the entrances, we did not come across any reliable text.

However, the Imāmiyyah have been doing it.¹

In other words, they do these acts in blind-imitation of their predecessors. It is as if their souls were not satisfied with the abundant shirk and acts thereof which is found in their books. Thus, they held on to that which their predecessors were doing. They are no different to the polytheists who said:

إِنَّا وَجَدْنَا آبَاءَنَا عَلَى أُمَّةٍ وَإِنَّا عَلَى آثَارِهِمْ مُهْتَدُونَ

Indeed, we found our fathers upon a religion, and we are, in their footsteps, following.²

Each Imām has a new set of polytheistic ideas attributed to him. This is to the extent that the awaited one—who is yet to be born—also has new ideas regarding the subject, such as facing the grave in ṣalāh whilst facing ones back to the Kaʿbah (as will appear later) and rubbing the cheeks on the grave; as they believe that the command to do this was issued from the ‘blessed corner’, i.e. from the awaited Mahdi through the medium of the representatives. They believe that the Mahdi said:

وَالَّذِي عَلَيْهِ الْعَمَلُ أَنْ يَضَعَ خَدَّهُ الْأَيْمَنَ عَلَى الْقَبْرِ

That which is practiced upon is that he places his right cheek upon the grave.³

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 100/136, ‘*Umdat al-Zāʿir*’ pg. 29

2 *Sūrah al-Zukhruf*: 23

3 ‘*Umdat al-Zāʿir*’ pg. 31

It is for this reason that their scholars state that among the etiquette of visiting these graves is:

وضع الخدّ الأيمن عند الفراغ من الزيارة والدّعاء

Placing the right cheek upon completing the visit and supplication.¹

They state:

لا كراهة في تقبيل الصّرايح؛ بل هو سنة عندنا ولو كان هناك نقيّة فتركه أولى

There is no problem with kissing the grave. In fact, it is Sunnah according to us. However, if there is (a reason to do) Taqiyyah, then it is better to leave it out.²

These are new ideas that were innovated by the evil scholars of the Rāfiḍah. The Muslims are unanimous that nothing should be touched or kissed besides the two right Rukns (the two pillars of the Ka'bah). The Ḥajr Aswad is touched and kissed, whilst the Rukn Yemāni is only touched. There is a view that it should also be kissed, however, this view is weak. There is nothing else that should be kissed or touched, even the rest of the Ka'bah, the boulder, the room of Nabī ﷺ, and the rest of the graves of the Ambiyā' عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام.³

The motive behind these ideas is to stop people from the religion of Allah and to call towards shirk. The pathway to it is set by these acts. There are some supplications which go hand in hand with these rituals the end result of which is the deification of the Imāms which makes the Shirk of the Shī'ah far worse than that of the polytheists of the pre-Islamic era.

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 100/134, 'Umdat al-Zā'ir pg. 30

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 100/136

3 *Majmū' Fatāwā* 4/521

iv. Taking the grave as a Qiblah like the House of Allah

The leading scholar of the Shī'ah, al-Majlisī says:

إنَّ استقبالَ القبرِ أمرٌ لازمٌ، وإن لم يكن موافقاً للقبلة.. واستقبال القبر للزائر بمنزلة استقبال القبلة وهو وجه الله، أي جهته التي أمر الناس باستقبالها في تلك الحالة

Facing the grave is a mandatory matter, even if it is not in the same direction as the Qiblah... Facing the grave, for the visitor is like facing the Qiblah; and it is the face of Allah, i.e. His direction, that he commanded the people to face in that condition.¹

Look at what al-Majlisī does when he finds (as usual) the following two narrations of his sect contradicting one another:

عن أبي جعفر محمد الباقر يقول: "إنَّ رسولَ الله صلى الله عليه وسلم.. قال: لا تَتَّخِذُوا قُبُورِي قِبْلَةً وَلَا مَسْجِدًا، فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ لَعَنَ الَّذِينَ اتَّخَذُوا قُبُورَ أَنْبِيَائِهِمْ مَسَاجِدَ"

Abū Ja'far Muḥammad al-Bāqir said, "Rasūlullah ﷺ said, 'Do not take my grave as a Qiblah or a place of ṣalāh, as Allah cursed those who took the graves of their Ambiyā' as places of ṣalāh.'"²

كتب الحميري إلى النّاحية المقدّسة يسأل عن الرّجل يزور قبور الأئمّة عليهم السّلام.. هل يجوز لمن صلّى عند بعض قبورهم عليهم السّلام أن يقوم وراء القبر ويجعل القبر قبلة أم يقوم عند رأسه أو رجليه؟ وهل يجوز أن يتقدم القبر ويصلي ويجعل القبر خلفه أم لا؟ فأجاب.. أمّا الصّلاة فإنّها خلفه ويجعل القبر أمامه، ولا يجوز أن يصلي بين يديه ولا عن يمينه ولا عن يساره؛ لأنّ الإمام صلى الله عليه لا يتقدم عليه ولا يساوي

Al-Himyarī³ wrote to the sacred corner (the non-existent awaited Mahdī) asking about a man who visits the graves of the Imāms, "Is it permissible

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/369

2 Ibn Bābuwayh: 'Ilal al-Sharā'i' pg. 358, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 100/128

3 'Abd Allah ibn Ja'far ibn Mālik al-Ḥimyarī. One of the great liars who claimed to have had correspondences with the awaited Mahdi. He is considered reliable by the Rawāfiḍ. Refer to *al-Fahrist* of al-Ṭūsī pg. 132, *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* pg. 106

for the one who performs ṣalāh at the graves of some of them عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام to stand behind the grave and take the grave as Qiblah and should he stand by the head or feet? Is it permissible to stand in front of the grave and perform ṣalāh with the grave behind him or not?"

The (imaginary) Maḥdī replied, "As for ṣalāh, it is behind the Imām and the grave should be in front of him. It is not permissible to perform ṣalāh in front of it, to the right of it or to the left of it, as the Imām is not stood in front of, nor is he stood next to."¹

Al-Majlisī gives preference to the second one. He says:

يمكن حمل الخبر السابق على التقية أو على أنه لا يجوز أن يجعل قبورهم بمنزلة الكعبة يتوجه إليها من كل جانب

It is possible to interpret the first narration as Taqiyyah or that it is not permissible to take their graves to be like the Ka'bah, which is faced from every direction.²

Among the scholars are those who interpret the first narration to mean ṣalāh in congregation and the second to mean individual ṣalāh. The narrations which support the second narration (of taking the grave as a Qiblah) will appear under the chapters of visiting.³

This is how their scholars supported shirk and rejected the truth, even though it appeared in their books. Al-Majlisī gives preference to that which is reported from the awaited one, which has no reality to it and rejects that which is reported from Abū Ja'far from Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, which matches the teachings of the Qur'ān,

1 Al-Ṭabarsī: *al-Iḥtijāj* 2/312, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 100/128

2 As it (the grave) is only the Qiblah from one direction according to them, unlike the Ka'bah which is the Qiblah from all directions. This is not out of their reverence for the Ka'bah but rather because they fear that it may lead to someone being in front of the grave, as is indicated to in *al-Tawqīf*.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 100/128

the Sunnah, and the consensus of the Muslims. Another juncture where al-Majlisī was reluctant to accept the word of his Imām is when he spoke regarding the manner of visiting the grave from far. He said:

اغتسل يوم الجمعة أو أي يوم شئت، والبس أطهر ثيابك واصعد إلى أعلى موضع في دارك أو الصحراء
فاستقبل القبلة بوجهك بعدما تبين أن القبر هنالك

Bath on Friday or any other day that you wish, wear your clothes which are most pure and climb to the highest place of your house or an open field. Face the Qiblah after ascertaining that the grave is there (in the same direction).

Al-Majlisī could not stomach this, as facing the grave is compulsory in his religion. Thus he said:

قوله: فاستقبل القبلة بوجهك لعله عليه السلام إنما قال ذلك لمن أمكنه استقبال القبر والقبلة معاً...
ويحتمل أن يكون المراد بالقبلة هنا جهة القبر مجازاً.. ولا يبعد أن تكون القبلة تصحيف القبر

His statement, 'Face the Qiblah'; perhaps he only said that regarding one for whom it is possible to face both, the grave as well as the Qiblah... It is possible that the figurative meaning of Qiblah i.e. the grave, is meant here... It is not far-fetched that 'Qiblah' was mistakenly written in place of 'grave'.¹

He had to go present all of these interpretations and twist the meaning to this extent to defend this stance of his regarding his sect:

حكموا باستقبال القبر مطلقاً وهو الموافق للأخبار الآخر في زيارة البعيد

They have declared that the grave should be faced at all times (i.e. during the different types of visitations), and this is in compliance with the other narrations regarding visiting from afar.²

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/369

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/369-370

He also says:

إنه مع بعد الزائر عن القبر يستحسن استقبال القبر في الصلاة واستدبار الكعبة

Even though the visitor is far from the grave, it is preferable that he should face the grave and face his back towards the Ka'bah.¹

This is regarding the two rak'ats of *Ziyārah* (visiting), regarding which they say:

إن ركعتي الزيارة لابد منهما عند كل قبر

The two rak'ats of *Ziyārah* are necessary at every grave.²

This is not surprising from a nation who believes that Karbalā' is greater than the Ka'bah. What is the name of this religion, which tells its followers to face their backs to the Ka'bah and their faces to the graves of the Imāms? What is the name of the religion of the scholars who call towards this? They may adopt any name for themselves, except Islam. Islam is a religion of monotheism. The Rasūl of Islam ﷺ strictly prohibited performing ṣalāh at graves. What then do you think he would say regarding performing ṣalāh towards the grave?

The irony, yet again, is that the prohibition from taking graves as places of ṣalāh and facing them appears in the very books of the Shī'ah such as *Al-Wasā'il* of al-Ḥurr al-Āmilī³ amongst others. Similarly, their books also state that performing ṣalāh towards any direction besides the Qiblah is incorrect.⁴ The endless contradictions

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/135

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/134

3 It is narrated in the books of the Shī'ah that 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn said, "Nabī ﷺ said, 'Do not take my grave as a Qiblah or a Masjid. Indeed Allah cursed the Jews upon taking the graves of their Ambiyā' as Masjids.'" *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* 1/57, *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 3/455. However, the religion of these people is based upon their scholars, who laid for them a foundational principle, "Oppose the masses (Ahl al-Sunnah)." Thus, they have led their people far away from the straight path.

4 The author of *al-Wasā'il* quoted five narrations in which this meaning is conveyed. Refer to *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 3/277. For further reading of the invalidity of performing ṣalāh towards any direction besides the Qiblah according to them, refer to *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* 1/79, 122, *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* 1/146, 178, 192, 218, *Furū' l-Kāfī* 1/83

in this religion is quite amazing! Nonetheless, that which was presented to you is only a fraction of what appears in their reliable sources on the topic of the graves. There is much more to it. The matter of the graves and its rites received the same amount of attention by them as the matter of Imāmāh.

The reliable books of their religion dedicate special sections to this, yet you will not find any of this in the books of the Muslims, who uphold monotheism. In *Biḥār al-Anwār* of al-Majlisī, there is a special book which is titled, *Kitāb al-Mazā'* (the book of the tomb). This book contains many chapters and hundreds of narrations. This book takes up almost three volumes of the latest print of *Biḥār al-Anwār*.¹

Wasā'il al-Shī'ah of al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī contains 106 chapters under the title, 'Chapters of the tomb'.² *Al-Wāfi* (which gathers the four seminal Shī'ī books) by al-Kāshānī has thirty three chapters under the title, 'The chapters of the tombs and graves'.³ *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* by Ibn Bābuwayh (one of their reliable works) has many chapters regarding the tombs and honouring them such as 'The chapter regarding the soil of Ḥusayn and the precincts of his grave' and 'Chapters regarding visiting the Imāms and its virtues'.⁴ *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* contains 86 chapters in which 276 narrations regarding visitations and the tombs are quoted.⁵ This is besides that which is contained in their other books which are equal in status to the eight fundamental sources (according to them) like *Thawāb al-A'māl* of Ibn Bābuwayh and others.

Besides all of the above, they have special books that were written in the past and in recent times regarding these visitations. A few of them are; *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* by Ibn Qūlawayh, *Mafātīḥ al-Jinān* by 'Abbās al-Qummī, *Umdat al-Zā'ir* by Ḥaydar al-Ḥusaynī and *Ḍiyā' al-Ṣālīḥīn* by al-Jawharī, etc. All of these books state the (fictitious) merits accrued by one who undertakes a special journey to visit the graves of the Imāms, do Ṭawāf around them, supplicate in their precincts and call out for help to the ones inside them. They also mention hundreds of

1 They are 100, 101 and 102.

2 10/251

3 Vol. 2 8/193

4 Refer to *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* 2/338

5 Refer to al-Nūr al-Ṭabarsī: *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* 2/189-234

supplications in which the extreme utterances regarding the Imāms raise them to the point of taking them as partners to the Creator. Only Allah knows the exact extent to which they go to in committing shirk.

The effect of their commitment to this doctrine, which destroys the foundation of Tawḥīd is quite visible in the lands of the Shī'ah. There, you will see that the houses of shirk, referred to as Mash-hads are well-attended, whereas the houses of Tawḥīd (the Masjids) are neglected. To this day, they remain committed to these acts of Shirk, as will be explained, Allah willing.¹

Analysing the practice of visiting the graves

The Muslims have one Ka'bah which they face when performing ṣalāh and at the time of supplication. It is the only place towards which they travel for the purposes of Ḥajj and Ṭawāf. The Shī'ah on the other hand have Mazārs, Mash-hads, and Ka'bah which are all the graves of dead people believed to be the Imāms² as well as others.³ These graves (according to them) compete with the House of Allah and even surpass it. Shirk is upheld in them and Tawḥīd is destroyed.

1 Refer to chapter three of the fourth section.

2 Many of these graves which are attributed to the Imāms do not contain their bodies. Neither is the place in Najaf, which is believed to be the grave of 'Alī عليه السلام, his actual grave nor is the place in Karbalā', which is believed to be the grave of Ḥusayn عليه السلام, his actual grave. This is something that is supported by historical records, even if the Shī'ah insist on denying it. Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb: *al-Muntaqā* pg. 158.

For further reading, refer to *Majmū' al-Fatāwā* 27/446. Ibn Taymiyyah says, "The reality of this is that most of these graves and tombs are disputed and false. Only a few of them can be traced with some certainty, after lengthy research. This is because knowing them and building masjids upon them is not part of the teachings of Islam."

3 The extremism of the Rāfiḍah in their attachment to graves led them towards showing devotion to the graves of people besides the Imāms as well. For example, refer to the chapter of the 'virtues of visiting the grave of 'Abd al-'Azīm al-Ḥasanī' in *Biḥār al-Anwār* (102/268). In here it is stated that Ḥasan al-'Askarī said:

من زار قبر عبد العظيم كان كمن زار قبر الحسين

Whoever visits the grave of 'Abd al-'Azīm is like the one who visited the grave of Ḥusayn.

Biḥār al-Anwār 102/268, *Thawāb al-A'māl* pg. 89, *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* pg. 324

Similarly, al-Majlisi has a chapter about visiting Fāṭimah bint Mūsā in Qum. Refer to *Biḥār al-Anwār* 102/265

It is sometimes claimed that shirk and tombs are wide-spread in the lands of the Ahl al-Sunnah as well. Ibn Taymiyyah dealt with this question under the discussion regarding the exaggeration of the Shī'ah with regard to their Imāms due to which they innovated many an practices. He says, "If it is said, 'A lot of that which you have described from the extremism, shirk, and innovations of the Shī'ah regarding their Imāms is found among those who are attributed to the Sunnah...'" He then replies by saying that whatever is prohibited by Allah and His Rasūl ﷺ is definitely worthy of criticism, whether the person doing it is attributed to the Sunnah or he is from the Shī'ah. However, that which the Rāfiḍah do in these aspects (which contradict the Qur'ān and Sunnah) surpasses that which is done by the Ahl al-Sunnah.¹

An important difference that I would like to highlight is that those of the Ahl al-Sunnah who carry out these acts are doing so whilst turning away from their beliefs whereas the Shī'ah who carry out these acts do so due to the encouragement and rewards promised in their books for these acts. In other words, these acts are proven from Shī'ī texts and refuted in Sunnī texts. Based on this, that which is found among the Ahl al-Sunnah can be corrected and reformed as opposed to that which is found among the Shī'ah, as it will be necessary to first change their seminal books.

The greatest danger and sickness is that shirk is portrayed as the truth in the reliable books of the Shī'ah, and it has become the actual dīn. Their seminal books, have many chapters, which include hundreds of narrations in which shirk is strengthened and re-iterated. As we explained, they even dedicated complete books to this evil. The Shī'ah adopted the same extremism regarding their Imāms that the Christians adopted regarding 'Īsā عليه السلام.

The Rawāfiḍ have left out worshipping Allah, hence you will see the Masjids (which Allah commanded to be raised and wherein his name should be remembered) are deserted whilst they revere the tombs that are built upon the graves. They attach

¹ Refer to *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/177-178

themselves to these places in the same way that the polytheists would attach themselves to their idols. They perform Ḥajj to these places instead of the House of Allah, and they consider travelling to them, doing Ṭawāf of them, performing ṣalāh by them, offering sacrifices in their vicinity, prostrating upon the grave, seeking help from it, and asking it for cure to be the greatest acts of worship, as proven earlier.

Who can be more misguided than those who prefer shirk over Tawḥīd, the Mash-hads over the Maṣjids, and Karbalā' over Makkah, 'Arafāh, and Minā?1 Who can be more misguided than one who exchanges the truth for falsehood and then believes that he is more rightly-guided than those who believe in Allah? It is obvious that Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not command his Ummah to do any of these deeds at the Mash-hads, nor did he ask them to carry out any 'rites' when visiting the graves of the Ambiyā' and the pious. Rather, this is from the religion of the polytheists regarding whom Allah said:

وَقَالُوا لَا تَذَرُنَّ آلِهَتَكُمْ وَلَا تَذَرُنَّ وَدًّا وَلَا سُوَاعًا وَلَا يَغُوثَ وَيَعُوقَ وَنَسْرًا

And they said, "Never leave your gods and never leave Wadd, Suwā', Yaghūth, Ya'ūq and Nasr."²

Ibn 'Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and others have stated:

هؤلاء.. أسماء رجال صالحين من قوم نوح، فلما هلكوا أوحى الشيطان إلى قومهم أن انصبوا إلى مجالسهم التي كانوا يجلسون أنصاباً وسموها بأسمائهم، ففعلوا، فلم تعبد، حتى إذا هلك أولئك وتنسخ العلم عبادت

These were the names of pious men from the nation of Nūḥ. When they passed away, the devil inspired their nation that they should erect statues at the places that these people would sit and name them after them. Thus,

1 Al-Jurjānī: *al-Mu'āraḍah fi al-Radd 'alā al-Rāfiḍah* scroll 71

2 Sūrah Nūḥ: 23

they did this. The (statues) were not worshipped (by them), however when this generation passed away and knowledge faded, they were worshipped.¹

Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said to Abū Hayāj al-Asadī:

ألا أبعثك على ما بعثني عليه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم؟ أن لا تدع تمثالاً إلا طمسته، ولا قبراً مشرفاً إلا سويته

Should I not send you to do that for which Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ sent me? Do not leave any statue except that you destroy it and do not leave any raised grave except that you flatten it.²

Ḥadīth of similar meaning are found in Shī'ī narrations as well. Al-Kulaynī reports from Abū 'Abd Allāh:

قال أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام: بعثني رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلى المدينة فقال: لا تدع صورة إلا محوها ولا قبراً إلا سويته

Amīr al-Mu'minīn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام said, "Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ sent me to Madīnah and said, 'Do not leave any picture, except that you scratch it out and do not leave any grave except that you flatten it.'"³

Another narration states:

بعثني رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في هدم القبور وكسر الصور

Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ sent me to destroy graves and pictures.⁴

1 Al-Bukhārī with *Faṭḥ al-Bārī* pg. 8/667

2 Muslim 4/88, 89, Abū Dāwūd 3/548, al-Tirmidhī 3/366, al-Nasa'ī 4/88-89, Aḥmad 1/96-129, Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī 1/168, al-Ḥākim 1/369, al-Bayhaqī (in *al-Sunan*) 4/3

3 Furū' al-Kāfī 2/227, Wasā'il al-Shī'ah 2/829

4 Furū' al-Kāfī 2/227, Wasā'il al-Shī'ah 2/870

Abū ‘Abd Allāh says:

نهى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن يصلى على قبر أو يقعد عليه أو يبنى عليه

Rasūlullāh ﷺ prohibited performing ṣalāh, sitting on, and building upon a grave.¹

Abū ‘Abd Allāh said on another occasion:

لا تبنوا على القبور... فإن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم كره ذلك

Do not build upon graves... Rasūlullāh ﷺ disliked that.²

He also reports from his fore-fathers, who in turn report that Rasūlullāh ﷺ:

نهى أن يجصص المقابر

He ﷺ forbade plastering graves.³

Al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī claimed that this prohibition included all graves “besides the grave of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the Imāms, and that this prohibition was merely to show dislike.”⁴ The above narrations are quite explicit in their purport, and they contain no exceptions. Similarly, there is no ambiguity in the fact that prohibition (and not merely dislike) was being declared. Al-‘Āmilī has no proof to back his claim besides the acts confined to his nation and the fabrications that are found in their books.

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* 1/130, *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 2/869

2 *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* 1/130, al-Barqī: *al-Maḥāsin* pg. 612, *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 2/870

3 Ibn Bābuwayh: *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* 2/194, *Amālī al-Ṣadūq* pg. 253, *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 2/870

4 This is clearly stated in the chapter heading (Building upon the grave of anyone besides the grave of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the Imāms is disliked). *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 2/869. However, the strange reality is that none of the narrations in this chapter substantiate his claim. Rather, they oppose the stance of the Shī’ah.

This is in fact a proof that the act is unfounded, as it does not conform to the Qur'ān, Sunnah or the consensus of the Ummah—amongst whom are the Ahl al-Bayt, who warned against these acts on account of them leading towards shirk. Further, the wisdom behind the prohibition does not differ from grave to grave. In fact, there is greater danger of shirk at the graves of the Imāms as compared to normal people. The origin of shirk is exaggeration and extremism regarding the pious.¹

The Shī'ite books contain narrations which are in stark conflict with their polytheistic beliefs. The supplications of the Imāms to Allah, their display of humility in His court and their confinement of their attention to him (which the Shī'ah narrate) expose the falseness of their beliefs and they expose the fact that the happenings at the tombs have no link at all with the teachings of these illustrious people. Ja'far al-Ṣādiq says in his supplication (as admitted by the Shī'ah in their books):

اللَّهُمَّ إِنِّي أَصْبَحْتُ لَا أَمْلِكُ لِنَفْسِي ضَرًّا وَلَا نَفْعًا وَلَا حَيَاةً وَلَا مَوْتًا وَلَا نَشُورًا، قَدْ ذَلَّ مَصْرَعِي، وَاسْتَكَانَ مَضِجِي، وَظَهَرَ ضَرِي، وَانْقَطَعَ عِذْرِي، وَقُلْ نَاصِرِي، وَأَسْلَمْنِي أَهْلِي وَوَالِدِي وَوَلَدِي بَعْدَ قِيَامِ حُجَّتِكَ عَلَيَّ، وَظَهَرَ بُرَاهِينُكَ عِنْدِي، وَوَضُوحُ أَدْلَتِكَ لِي.

اللهم وقد... أعيت الحيل، وتغلقت الطرق، وضاعت المذاهب، ودرست الآمال إلا منك، وانقطع الرجاء إلا من جهتك..

O Allah I am witnessing the morning in a state that I do not have any control over that which is harmful for me, beneficial for me, my life, my death, and my resurrection. The strongest point of my body has become humble, my side has become motionless, my difficulty has become apparent, my excuse has come to an end, and my helpers have become few. My family, my father, and my son have handed me over after your proof became established against me and your evidence and substantiations have become clear to me. O Allah... plans have become useless, roads have been blocked and paths have become narrow. Allah hopes have faded except in you and all expectations have come to an end except from you.²

1 Refer to *Kitāb al-Tawhīd* (with its commentary *Taysīr al-ʿAzīz al-Ḥamīd*) pg. 305

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 86/318, *Mahj al-Da'wāt* pg. 216

This is the manner in which Ja'far al-Šādiq pleads in the court of His Rabb. He does not have any control over that which is beneficial or harmful for him. How is it then that he has control of this for others? This supplication was whilst he was alive. After his death, how can anything be expected from him? Similar supplications have been narrated from many of the Imāms.¹ The Shī'ah also report the supplication of 'Alī رضي الله عنه, whilst picturing himself in his grave. He said:

إلهي كأني بنفسي قد أضجعت في حقرتها، وانصرف عنها المشيعون من جيرتها.. ولم يخف على الناظرين ضرر فافتها.. قد توسدت الثرى وعجز حيلتها..

O my Lord, it is as if I am made to lay in its lowest part and those who accompanied it (my body) have turned away from its vicinity... The harmfulness of its deficiency was not hidden to the onlookers... It took the soil as a pillow and its plans have become useless...²

He has no plan of his own. Rather, he relies upon the mercy and benevolence of Allah. How then can a person ask for intercession and forgiveness at his grave and forget the One Whose mercy is all-Encompassing and Whose bounty is tremendous. Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه could not defend himself from being killed, so how could he be asked for that which is not in the control of anyone besides Allah? Added to that, the books of the Shī'ah report that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم would seek protection on behalf of Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما using these words:

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم: أعوذ نفسي وديني وأهلي ومالي وولدي وخواتيم عملي، وما رزقني ربي وخولني بعة ربي وعظمة الله..

In the name of Allah, the Entirely Merciful, the Most Merciful. I seek protection with the honour and grandeur of Allah for myself, my religion, my family, my wealth, my offspring, my final acts, and that which my Rabb provided me with and gave me.³

1 Refer to *Biḥār* 86/240, 94/89

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 94/93-94

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 94/264, *Mahj al-Da'wāt* pg. 13

He is unable to protect himself from the evil that comes his way except through the protection of Allah. If this was whilst he was alive, then what can be said about him after his death? In a nutshell, there are no intermediaries between Allah and His creation. If someone wants to insist that intermediaries did exist, his claim will only be correct if he is intending those intermediaries who passed the message of Allah to the creation, i.e. the Ambiyā". Besides them, there are no intermediaries of any type.

Discussion Four

Their Belief That the Imām can Prohibit and Make Lawful What he Desires

One of the fundamental aspects of Tawhīd is the belief that Allah ﷻ alone is the legislator; He can authorise what He desires and prohibit what He desires. The Messengers ﷺ of Allah are merely propagators of His law. Whoever claims that his Imām can make lawful or prohibit whatever he desires is indeed included in the verse of the Qur’ān:

أَمْ لَهُمْ شُرَكَاءُ شَرَعُوا لَهُمْ مِّنَ الدِّينِ مَا لَمْ يَأْذُنْ بِهِ اللَّهُ

Do they believe in associates who have legislated for them a religion which Allah ﷻ has not sanctioned?¹

The Shī’ah claim, as stated in their narrations:

خلق الله محمدا وعلياً وفاطمة فمكثوا ألف دهر ثم خلق جميع الأشياء فأشهدهم خلقها وأجري طاعتهم عليها وفوض أمورهم اليها فهم يحلون ما يشاءون ويحرمون ما يشاءون.

Allah ﷻ created Muḥammad, ‘Alī, and Fāṭimah. He made them witnesses over the creation which he created a thousand years later, ordained obedience to them upon it, and handed its affairs over to them. They, therefore, have the authority to authorise or prohibit whatever they want.²

Al-Majlisī has also quoted a portion of this narration:

وأجري طاعتهم عليها أي أوجب وألزم علي جميع الأشياء طاعتهم حتي الجمادات من السماويات والأرضيات كشق القمر وإقبال الشجر وتسييح الحصي وأمثالها مما لا يحصي وفوض أمورها إليهم من التحليل والتحرير والعطاء والمنع.
أحكام التحليل والتحرير إليهم.

1 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 21

2 Uṣūl al-Kāfi 1/441; Biḥār al-Anwār 25/340

‘And ordained obedience to them upon it’ means that he has made obedience to them compulsory in everything including inanimate entities, the heavenly creations, as well the earthly ones; e.g. the splitting of the moon, the submission of trees, the glorification (*Tasbīḥ*) of pebbles, etc. ‘And has handed its affairs over to them’ i.e. in terms of legitimisation (*Taḥlīl*), prohibition (*Taḥrīm*), granting (*‘Aṭā*) and deprivation (*Man*).¹

He then goes on to explain that the evident meaning of this text proves that the prerogative of legitimisation and prohibition was accorded to them.

Al-Mufīd in his book *al-Ikhtiṣāṣ* and al-Majlisī in his book *Al-Biḥār*, among others, have quoted an explicit narration in this regard from Abū Ja‘far (Muḥammad al-Bāqir):

من احللنا له شيئاً اصابه من أعمال الظالمين فهو حلال لأن الأئمة منا مفوض اليهم فما أحلوا فهو حلال وما حرموا فهو حرام.

The one for who we make lawful a vice usually considered from the doings of oppressors² which he does is permissible for him. Because the Imāms amongst us have been accorded the divine authority; thus whatever they make lawful is lawful and whatever they prohibit is forbidden.”³

In this way the Shī‘ah affirm that their Imāms have the prerogative of legislation, legitimisation, and prohibition. Thus whatever they deem lawful from the general treasury of the Muslims is fine and whatever they deem forbidden is forbidden... They have made their Imāms deities other than Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى by attributing the prerogative of prohibition, legitimisation, and legislation to them; thus ascribing partners to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى in his exclusive oneness as a Rabb. The reason being that sovereignty and divine legislation are the exclusive qualities of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, just

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/341-342

2 The term ‘Oppressors’ according to the Shī‘ah refers to all the rulers of the Islamic empire besides ‘Alī and Ḥasan عَلَيْهِمَا السَّلَام, since the other Imāms did not rule even for a day. And every other ruler is therefore an oppressor and a usurper of the Imāms as they assume.

3 *Al-Ikhtiṣāṣ* p. 330; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/334; *Baṣā‘ir al-Darajāt* p.113.

as their adherence to a law which is in complete contrast with the law of Allah ﷻ and which might at times abrogate, confine, or specify elements of the law introduced by Rasūlullāh ﷺ, equates to the worship of deities other than Allah ﷻ.

Nevertheless, the prerogative of legislation is the sole right of the Rabb of Man. The Messengers ﷺ are merely propagators on his behalf. They cannot prohibit or legitimise anything besides that which Allah ﷻ orders them to or reveals to them.

Allah ﷻ has plainly mentioned in the Qur'ān the status of a person who follows his seniors in what they allow and prohibit after having discarded the law of Allah ﷻ. Allah ﷻ says:

اتَّخَذُوا أَحْبَارَهُمْ وَرُهْبَانَهُمْ أَرْبَابًا مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ

They have taken their priests and Rabbis as deities besides Allah ﷻ.¹

Allah ﷻ equates their obedience to their seniors in matters which they legitimate and prohibit (as appears in the exegesis of the verse²) to worshipping them:

تلقوا الحلال و الحرام من جهتهم و هو أمر لا يتلقي إلا من جهة الله عز و جل.

They were receptive to the self-prescribed permissions and prohibitions of their leaders, whereas they ought to be received only from Allah ﷻ.³

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 31.

2 *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 10/113-114; *Tafsīr Ibn al-Kathīr* 2/373-374. In *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* there is a narration from Abū 'Abd Allāh ﷻ which affirms this interpretation. It reads as follows:

Behold! I swear in the name of Allah ﷻ that they had not called them to the worship of idols. Had they done so the people would not have obeyed them. But they legitimised the impermissible and prohibited the permissible so conspicuously that they, the people, did not realise. *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/53; Ṭabarsī: *Majma' al-Bayān* 3/48-49; al-Baḥrānī: *al-Burhān* 2/120-121; al-Kāshānī: *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 2/336.

3 Ibn 'Aṭīyah: *al-Muḥarrar al-Wajīz* 8/166.

This Shī'ī belief resembles the Christian belief regarding their leaders in that they all have taken their priests and rabbis as deities other than Allah ﷻ.

After the Shī'ah considered their Imāms to be the source of legislation, they took a step further by claiming that all people are the slaves of the Imāms. This makes their polytheism even more obvious. Al-Riḍā states:

الناس عبيد لنا في الطاعة موال لنا في الدين فليبلغ الشاهد الغائب.

People are our slaves in worship and sincerely faithful to us in religion. Hence, those who are present should convey this to those who are absent.¹

Whereas Allah ﷻ says in the Noble Qur'ān:

مَا كَانَ لِبَشَرٍ أَنْ يُؤْتِيَهُ اللَّهُ الْكِتَابَ وَالْحُكْمَ وَالنُّبُوَّةَ ثُمَّ يَقُولَ لِلنَّاسِ كُونُوا عِبَادًا لِي مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ

It is not behoving of a human that Allah ﷻ endows him with a divine book, wisdom and nubuwwah then he goes about preaching to people: Become my servants rather than Allah's ﷻ.²

So, people in totality are the servants of Allah ﷻ, not of anyone else even if he be from among the Messengers of Allah ﷻ bestowed with divine revelation, wisdom and nubuwwah. What can be said then about the Imāms of the Shī'ah or anyone else who is claimed to be an Imām.

Furthermore, just as the Imāms are the source of legitimisation and prohibition, they equally have the right to either convey these laws to people or conceal them. It appears in *al-Kāfī* and other books:

عن معلي بن محمد عن الوشاء قال: سألت الرضا رضي الله عنه فقلت له: جعلت فداك فأسألكم أهل الذكر إن كنتم لا تعلمون فقال نحن أهل الذكر ونحن المسؤولون قلت فأنتم المسؤولون ونحن السائلون؟ قال

1 Al-Mufīd, *al-Amālī* p. 48; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/279.

2 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 79

نعم قلت حقا علينا أن نسألكم؟ قال نعم قلت حقا عليكم أن تجيبونا؟ قال لا ذاك إلينا إن شئنا فعلنا و إن شئنا لم نفعل.

I asked al-Riḍā saying, may my soul be sacrificed for you (what is the explanation of the verse) “Ask the people of knowledge if you do not know.”

He said, “We are the people of knowledge and we are a reference for the people.”

I asked, “So you are the reference and we are the seekers?”

He said, “Yes”

I further added, “So, it is our duty to refer to you?”

He responded in the affirmative. I then asked, “Is it then equally your duty to respond to our questions?”

He replied, “No! That is left to our discretion; we can answer if we want to and if we desire we can refuse.”¹

There are many other narrations in this regard.

This privilege was not even accorded to the Rasūl of guidance ﷺ, the best of all the prophets ﷺ. Allah ﷻ says:

وَأَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ الذِّكْرَ لِتُبَيِّنَ لِلنَّاسِ مَا نُزِّلَ إِلَيْهِمْ

We revealed the admonishment (al-Dhikr) to you so that you may preach to the people that which has been revealed to them.²

Likewise he says:

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfi 1/210-211; Biḥār al-Anwār 23/172-188; Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī 2/261; al-Ḥimyarī: Qurb al-Isnād p. 152-153.

2 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 44

يَا أَيُّهَا الرَّسُولُ بَلِّغْ مَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكَ مِنْ رَبِّكَ وَإِنْ لَمْ تَفْعَلْ فَمَا بَلَغْتَ رِسَالَتَهُ

O Messenger ﷺ! Convey that which has been revealed to you by your Lord. And if you do not do so you have not conveyed your message (holistically).¹

Allah ﷻ has sounded a very grave warning for the one who conceals the truth and guidance which He has revealed. He says:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يَكْتُمُونَ مَا أُنْزِلَنَا مِنَ الْبَيِّنَاتِ وَالْهُدَىٰ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا بَيَّنَّاهُ لِلنَّاسِ فِي الْكِتَابِ ۖ أُولَٰئِكَ يَلْعَنُهُمُ اللَّهُ وَيَلْعَنُهُمُ اللَّاعِنُونَ

Verily those who conceal the clear verses and guidance which we have revealed after we have plainly mentioned them in the book, upon them is the curse of Allah ﷻ and the curse of the cursers.²

Likewise, there is a tradition which has been narrated in variant ways from Nabī ﷺ in which he states:

من سئل عن علم ثم كتمه الجم يوم القيامة بلجام من النار

A person who is asked about knowledge which he keeps concealed will be bridled with a bridle of fire on the Day of Judgment.³

Is it still then possible to claim that the propagation of the guidance and truth which is indispensable for the commonality is based upon personal motives, temperament, and desire; owing to which it is claimed that:

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 67

2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 159

3 *Musnad Aḥmad* 2/263, 305, 344, 353, 495, 499, 508; *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* 4/67; *Sunan al-Tirmidhī* 5/29. Tirmidhī has graded this ḥadīth as Ḥasan. *Sunan Ibn Mājah* 1/96; *Mustadrak al-Ḥākim* 1/101. It is considered Ṣaḥīḥ according to al-Dhahabī as well. *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* 1/260.

ليس علينا الجواب إن شئنا أجبننا وإن شئنا أمسكنا.

Answering is not compulsory upon us; if we desire we answer or else we don't.¹

It is due to the preaching of religion being left to the discretion of the Imāms that the Shī'ah have remained in the dark with regards the teachings of their faith as is attested to in their traditions:

لا يعرفون مناسك حجهم و حلالهم و حرامهم حتي كان أبو جعفر (محمد الباقر) ففتح لهم و بين مناسك حجهم و حلالهم و حرامهم.

They were unaware of the rites of their Ḥajj, likewise of permissible and impermissible matters, till eventually Abū Ja'far Muḥammad al-Bāqir came. Who explicated their faith for them, educated them regarding the rites of Ḥajj, and permissible and impermissible affairs.²

The Shī'ah did not suffice on this, rather they postulated that their Imāms have the prerogative of leading people astray and giving them various conflicting answers. In *al-Ikhtisās* by al-Mufīd—and other books as well—there appears a narration from Mūsā ibn Ashyam. He relates:

دخلت علي أبي عبد الله فسألته عن مسألة فأجبتني فيها بجواب، فأنا جالس إذا دخل رجل فسأله عنها بعينها فأجابه بخلاف ما أجابني، فدخل رجل آخر فسأله عنها بعينها فأجابه بخلاف ما أجابني و خلاف ما أجاب به صاحبي، ففزعت من ذلك و عظم علي، فلما خرج القوم نظر إلي و قال: يا ابن اشم إن الله فوض إلي داود أمر ملكه فقال: هذا عطاؤنا فامنن أو أمسك بغير حساب و فوض إلي محمد صلي الله عليه وسلم و آل و سلم أمر دينه فقال و ما آتاكم الرسول فخذوه و ما نهاكم عنه فانتهوا. و إن الله فوض إلي الأئمة منا و إلينا ما فوض إلي محمد صلي الله عليه وسلم فلا تجزع

I went to visit Abū 'Abd Allāh and asked him a question which he answered. While I was sitting by him there appeared a man who posed the exact same question, to which he responded differently. Thereafter, a third person emerged who similarly posed the very same question, surprisingly he gave

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/212

2 *Ibid* 2/20

an answer different to the answers he gave me and my companion. I was thus startled and appalled. Hence, when everyone had left he looked at me and said, “O Ibn Ashyam! Allah ﷻ gave Dāwūd authority over his kingdom. He thus said, ‘This is our grant to thee. So be gracious therein or withhold without any reckoning.’¹ And he likewise gave Muḥammad authority over the affairs of his religion. Hence he said, ‘Embrace that which the Rasūl has given you and desist from that which he has prohibited.’² And Allah ﷻ has conferred upon the Imāms from amongst us the authority he had conferred upon Muḥammad ﷺ so do not worry.”³

It is in this manner that they fabricate against these illustrious personalities. In essence according to their narrations their Imāms are legislators and the authority of legitimisation and prohibition is under their jurisdiction. They have the right to conceal from people that which is indispensable for them with the inclusion of the fundamentals of Islam and its core structures; if they want they can answer and if they desire they can refuse. And thus the Shī‘ah were ignorant regarding the rituals of Ḥajj till the era of al-Bāqir. For they did not and do not subscribe to the teachings of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. They strictly subscribe to the preaching of their Imāms who concealed from them the knowledge of worship.

And the chain of forgeries crafted by this cult against the religion of Allah ﷻ, His Book, His Rasūl, and the Ahl al-Bayt continue unceasingly. By their claim of partisanship for the Ahl al-Bayt they camouflage the true nature of these reprehensible doctrines and blasphemous ideas. Thus, one would rightfully ask: Are these people really the *Shī‘ah* (partisans) of ‘Alī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn and ‘Alī Zayn al-‘Ābidīn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ despite fabricating all these lies against them, accusing them of not preaching issues permissible or impermissible, and those of Ḥajj; claiming that concealing the truth and misleading people by offering them conflicting answers is an integral part of their faith?

1 Sūrah Ṣād: 39

2 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 7.

3 *Al-Ikhtisāṣ* p. 329-330; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 23/185.

Discussion Five

Their Belief That the Sand of Ḥusayn's Grave is a Cure for Every Sickness.

The Shī'ah claim—against the divine texts, rationality, English and Greek medicine—that the sand of Ḥusayn's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ grave is a guaranteed cure for all sorts of ailments and diseases. It is as if they have placed their faith in something which by experiment, observation, nature, and logic has been proven to be of no benefit. They deem it beneficial and claim that cure can be procured from soil and not from the Lord of lords. Opposing the verse of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى:

وَلَا يَمَسُّكَ اللَّهُ بِضُرٍّ فَلَا كَاشِفَ لَهُ إِلَّا هُوَ

And if Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى inflicts you with difficulty there is no one that can alleviate it save him.¹

Likewise the verse:

أَمَّنْ يُجِيبُ الْمُضْطَرَّ إِذَا دَعَاهُ وَيَكْشِفُ السُّوءَ

Who is the one who responds to the distressed when he calls out to him and alleviates hardship?²

And the verse:

وَإِذَا مَرَضْتُ فَبِهِ شَفِيتُ

And when I take ill he cures me.³

1 Sūrah Yūnus: 107

2 Sūrah al-Naml: 62

3 Sūrah al-Shu'arā': 80

Hence, they mirrored the polytheists in their belief that stones can benefit and harm by claiming that sand can provide cure.

The author of *Bihār al-Anwār* has quoted eighty three narrations with regards to the soil of Ḥusayn عليه السلام, its virtues, etiquettes, and rulings.¹ These narrations claim that it is a healing balsam for every sickness and a fortified fort against every fear.² It cures the sickly so effectively that it leaves him without any trace of sickness.³ If a child is made to suck upon it, it becomes a source of protection for him from every threat.⁴ If it is placed in the grave of a deceased person it guarantees him safety from its punishment. A person who holds it in his hand and plays with it receives the reward of those who glorify Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, for it glorifies Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى in his hand even though he does not.⁵

1 Ibid 101/118-140

2 There are many narrations in this regard, e.g. Ḥārith ibn Mughīrah says, “I Asked Abū ‘Abd Allāh, ‘I have a large family and am a very sickly person. I have experimented with every type of medicine but to no avail.’ He said, ‘Don’t you know about the sand of Ḥusayn’s grave, in it there is a cure for every ailment and security from every threat.’” (Al-Ṭūsī: *Amālī* 1/415; *Bihār al-Anwār* 101/119, also refer to *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 10/415; *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt*, p. 278, 285.

3 They have forged many narrations and tales in this regard. Each one of the narrators reports the tale of his personal ailment and pain, then his subsequent consumption of the soil of Ḥusayn which cured him completely as if he was not afflicted with any sickness whatsoever. One of them says at the end of his tale, “When the drink settled in my belly it was as if I was released from ropes. (*Bihār al-Anwār* 101/121-122; *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* p. 275.

4 Abū ‘Abd Allāh سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says, “Make your infants suck upon the sand of Ḥusayn for in it lies safety.” (*Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* p. 278; *Bihār al-Anwār* 101/124).

5 It appears in *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* of al-Ṭūsī that Muḥammad al-Ḥimyarī said, “I wrote a letter to the awaited Mahdi asking him if it was permissible for a man to make Tasbīḥ with the sand of the grave? And is there any virtue in it? He replied thus, I read his signature on the letter which was later copied, “Read Tasbīḥ with it for it supersedes all other forms of Tasbīḥ. One of its virtues is that if the reader forgets to read the Tasbīḥ and merely handles the sand in his hand then to will he still reap the reward of Tasbīḥ.” (*Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* 6/75; *Bihār al-Anwār* 101/132-133). The following appears in another narration, “If he handles it whilst remembering Allah he gets forty rewards and if he handles it merely playing with it without remembering Allah he gets twenty rewards.” (*Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* 6/75; *Bihār al-Anwār* 101/132). They have equated playing and futility to the worship of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and have legislated whatever is in harmony with their desires.

If any Shī'ī experiences the pains of sickness and its severity he should head to the sand of the tomb—for which he ought to select an appropriate time (as is mentioned in their narrations)—in the depth of a jet-black night, preferably its last portion, then he should take a bath and wear the cleanest of his clothing. When he reaches there he should stand at the head (of Ḥusayn عليه السلام) and pray. When he is done praying he should do a prolonged prostration wherein he should repeat the word “*Shukran*” (thanks) a thousand times. Thereafter he should stand and embrace the tomb, saying:

يا مولاي يابن رسول الله إني آخذ من تربتك بإذنك اللهم فاجعلها شفاء من كل داء و عزا من كل ذل و
أمنا من كل خوف و غني من كل فقر.

O my master! O the grandson of Rasūlullāh! I desire to take some of your soil if you permit; O Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى make it thus a cure for every ailment, an honour against every disgrace, a guard against all fears and a means of affluence against poverty.¹ Lastly, he should take three fingers-full of the sand and (as ordered in the narrations) place it in a clean piece of material and cover it with a silver ring the stone of which should be carnelian. He should thereafter use the amount of a chickpea at the time of need. This will guarantee him a cure.²

Another narration adds that he should pretend to cry and say:

بسم الله و بالله و بحق هذه التربة المباركة و بحق الوصي الذي تواريه و بحق جده و أبيه و أمه و أخيه و
بحق أولاده الصادقين و بحق الملائكة المقيمين عند قبره ينتظرون نصرته صلي عليهم أجمعين و اجعل
لي و لأهلي و ولدي و أخوتي فيه الشفاء من كل داء.

In the name of Allah, with the help of Allah, with the right of this blessed sand, with the right of the successor (of the prophets) which it covers, with the rights of his grandfather, father, mother, and brother, with the rights of his righteous progeny, and with the rights of the angels that throng around

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 101/37; *Miṣbāḥ al-Zā'ir* p. 136.

2 *Ibid.*

his grave ever waiting to aid him. Send salutations upon them all and place in this sand cure from every ailment for me, my family, my offspring, and my siblings...”¹

Another narration suggests other methods of seeking healing by the medium of the sand. It reads as follows:

Abū ‘Abd Allāh سُبْحَانَهُ وَرَبُّهُ says, “Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَرَبُّهُ has made the soil of the grave of my grandfather a cure for every sickness and a guard against all threats. Hence when any of you takes it in his hand he should first kiss it, pass it over his eyes, and thereafter, his entire body. Then he should say:

اللهم بحق هذه التربة وبحق من حل بها و ثوي فيها...

O Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَرَبُّهُ I ask you with the right of this sand and with the right of the one who resides within it...”²

And yet another narration states the method of taking the sand in terms of quantity and method. Imām Ja‘far is alleged to have said:

إذا تناول التربة أحدكم فليأخذ بأطراف أصابعه و قدره مثل الحمصة فليقبلها و ليضعها علي عينه..

When any of you intends to take the sand he should take with the tips of his fingers the amount equivalent to a chickpea. Subsequently he should kiss it and place it upon his eyes...”³

In essence, this is a mobile hospital that every Shī‘ī is able to carry with him.

Nevertheless, it seems as if this sand worsened their ailments instead of curing them, for (as the proverb goes) he who attaches himself to something is handed

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/138

2 *Al-Ṭūsī: Amālī* 1/326; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/121

3 *Makārim al-Akhlāq* p. 189; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/120

over to it. Hence, we see that one of the Shī'ah complained to his Imām about his inability and weakness, whereupon the Imām consoled him by saying:

كذلك جعل الله أوليائنا وأهل مودتنا وجعل البلاء إليهم سريعا

This is how Allah has made our friends and our admirers. And Allah has made trials come their way very fast.”¹

Moving on, just as a Shī'ī resorts to his sand idol when afflicted with a sickness he likewise resorts to it at the time of fear and confrontation of the enemy. Hence, he carries it with him in times of fear as well. Their Imām says:

إذا خفت سلطانا أو غير سلطان فلا تخرجن من منزلك إلا ومعك من قبر الحسين

When you fear a ruler or anyone else do not leave your house except that you have some sand from the grave of Ḥusayn with you.²

The Imām further instructs him to supplicate thus:

اللهم إني أخذته من قبر وليك وابن وليك فاجعله لي أمنا وحرزا لما أخاف وما لا أخاف

O Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى I have taken this from the grave of your friend; the son of your friend. Thus, make it a guard and a fort for me against things which I fear and things which I don't.³

The narrator of this narration does not forget to remind his people that when he done this he was secured from whatever he feared and did not fear, and that he did not witness anything unpleasant.⁴

1 *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* p. 275; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/120

2 *Amālī* 1/325; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/118

3 *Ibid*

4 *Ibid*

Likewise, to procure this sand is the desire of the damsels of Jannah. They, thus, (as is narrated in the fairy tales of the Shī'ah) request the angels to bring back some sand from the grave of Ḥusayn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام as gifts for them when they descend to the earth.¹

Similarly, they claim that prostrating on this sand penetrates all seven veils (between a person and his creator).²

These are but a few claims of the Shī'ah regarding the sand of Ḥusayn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. It is almost as if, due to these beliefs of theirs, they have outdone the polytheists who merely claimed that their idols were intermediaries who took them closer to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. This is due to the fact that they have ascribed attributes to the sand which are purely the attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and thus deified it together with him.

The idea of seeking cure from this sand is utterly reprehensible and a blatant lie. It is definitely from the dogma of the Shī'ah and not from the religion of Islam. There is no mention of it whatsoever in the Qur'ān, nor in the teaching of our Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

وَمَنْ يَتَّبِعْ غَيْرَ الْإِسْلَامِ دِينًا فَلَنْ يُقْبَلَ مِنْهُ وَهُوَ فِي الْآخِرَةِ مِنَ الْخَاسِرِينَ

And anyone who seeks any other religion besides Islam it will never be accepted from him. And in the afterlife he will be from amongst the losers.³

Similarly:

قُلْ هُوَ الَّذِي آمَنُوا هُدًى وَشِفَاءً

Say it (the Qur'an) is a source of guidance and cure for those who believe.⁴

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/134; Muḥammad al-Mahdi Kitāb al-Mazār p. 119

2 *Al-Ṭūsī Miṣbāḥ al-Mujtahid* p. 511; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 101/135

3 *Sūrah Āl 'Imrān*: 85

4 *Sūrah al-Fuṣṣilāt*: 44

Likewise:

وَنَزَّلُ مِنَ الْقُرْآنِ مَا هُوَ شِفَاءٌ وَرَحْمَةٌ لِّلْمُؤْمِنِينَ

And we reveal from the Qur'ān that which is a cure and a mercy unto the believers.¹

The Sunnah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ is in a like manner orientated upon supplication and daily worship. Therein a person is exhorted to turn to Allah ﷻ alone and not to any sand or idol; in fact not even to any esteemed angel or sent prophet. And by way of the Sunnah (through the permission of Allah ﷻ) safety and security come to fruition for a Muslim.² Obviously not forgetting that a Muslim has been ordered to utilise the natural causes of cure.

As for consuming sand, it is a major innovation and a joke only to be found in the creed of the Shī'ah.

1 Sūrah al-Isrā': 82

2 Refer to the following books: *al-Adhkār* of al-Nawawī, *al-Kalim al-Ṭayyib* of Ibn Taymiyyah, *al-Wābil al-Ṣayyib* of Ibn Qayyim and *Tuḥfah al-Dhākirīn* of al-Shawkānī.

Discussion Six

Their Supplication by way of Charms and Esoteric Symbols and Their Seeking of Help From Unknown Entities

One form of their misguidance and shirk is their supplications with charms and letters which they consider to be from their Imāms' forts, their supplications and shield. They write these charms and read them in order to gain cure and safety. In this regard al-Majlisī has quoted many a narration in his book *Al-Biḥār*; similarly he has documented words which do not possess any meaning and has placed sketches of some charms which are written in a very eerie font claiming that this was the method of the Imāms in order to gain cure.¹

According to the Shī'ah, riddled letters which have no meanings were used by their Imāms to seek refuge from evil.² Whereas Allah ﷻ says:

وَلِلّٰهِ الْأَسْمَاءُ الْحُسْنَىٰ فَادْعُوهُ بِهَا

And Allah has beautiful names so call unto him by way of them.³

1 An example of one such charm is the following: the treasure of Amīr al-Mu'minīn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام for an enchanted person, a possessed person, an unconscious person, a poisoned person, for protection against the ruler, the devil and all that a person fears. It reads as the following:

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ أَيُّ كُنُوشٍ أُرَشِّشُ عَطِيطِيْطِحْ يَا مَطِيطِرُونَ فَرِيَا لِسُنُونِ مَا وَمَا سَامَا سَوِيَا طِيطِشَا لَوْشَ خِيطُوشِ...

Thereafter there is a sketch of weird symbols in the form of intertwining lines... (*Biḥār al-Anwār*: 94/193). There are similarly sketches of this nature on p. 229, 265, 297 of the same volume.

One of the protective supplications of the Imāms read as follows:

أَعُوذُ بِمَا أَهْيَا شَرَاهِيَا

The reference is same as the above cited narration.

2 One such example is the following:

اللَّهُمَّ بِالْعَيْنِ وَالْمِيمِ وَالْفَاءِ الْحَاءَيْنِ بَنُورِ أَبُو الْأَشْبَاحِ... إِكْفَنِي شَرَّ مَنْ دَبَّ وَمَشَى...

They consider these to be a barrier which the Imāms read to secure themselves against the evil of any who intended bad for them. (Ibid).

3 Sūrah al-A'rāf: 180

Writing such riddles and charms with letters and amulets is indeed ascribing partners with Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, the unique and the powerful. For it is a form of supplication to others besides Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى due to it not containing any of his names or attributes. And the names of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى are those which appear in the Qur'ān and the Sunnah; they are based upon divine sources and hence, it would not be permissible for us to call unto him with any other name.

Similarly, these charms have no specific meaning. Imām al-Ṣāghhānī, therefore, says:

و ربما يكون التلفظ بتلك الكلمات كفرا لأننا لا نعرف معنيها بالعربية، و قد قال الله تعالى ما فرطنا في الكتاب من شيء

And at times the enunciation of these words can lead to disbelief because we do not know their meanings in Arabic. Allah says, “We have not left any aspect of the book unaddressed.”¹ And yet he (the Shīṭī) still says:

آهيا شراھيا

Āhiyā Sharāhiyā.²

Al-Ṣāghhānī further goes onto mention that many people were led astray due to these unfounded supplications.³

As to seeking help from unknown entities, they seek help from them when losing direction on a journey; very similar to how they seek help from the dead (as has passed earlier). Whereas seeking help from the dead, from among the angels, Jinns, and humans who are not visible to those who seek help from them (in order to derive benefit or circumvent harm), is a type of shirk which Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى will not forgive unless a person repents sincerely from it. Because seeking help in this manner is considered to be an 'Ibādah which is not permissible but for Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.

1 Sūrah al-An'ām: 38

2 Mawḍū'āt al-Ṣāghhānī p. 63

3 Ibid

The evidence for this is what Allah ﷻ has taught us to read in the verse:

إِيَّاكَ نَعْبُدُ وَإِيَّاكَ نَسْتَعِينُ

It is only thee that we worship and it is only from thee that we seek help.¹

Likewise the verse:

وَقَضَىٰ رَبُّكَ أَلَّا تَعْبُدُوا إِلَّا إِيَّاهُ

Allah ﷻ has decreed that you worship none but him.²

There are many other verses which establish the same point.³

The following appears in their reliable books:

عن أبي بصير عن أبي عبد الله قال: إذا ضللت الطريق فناد يا صالح أو يا أبا صالح أرشدونا إلى الطريق
يرحمكم الله.

Abū Basīr narrates from Abū ‘Abd Allāh that he said, “When you lose your way on journey announce thus, “O Ṣāliḥ,” or “O Abū Ṣāliḥ, show us the way. May Allah shower His Mercy upon you.”⁴

Ibn Bābuwayh states the following after citing the previous narration under the chapter, ‘the prayer of a person who loses his way’:

1 Sūrah al-Fātiḥah: 5

2 Sūrah al-Isrā’: 23

3 This was the legal verdict (Fatwā) given by the council of scholars for academic discussions (*al-Lajnah al-Dā’imah li al-Buḥūth al-‘Ilmiyyah*). Refer to: *Jarīdah al-Jazīrah* (published on Friday the 6th of Rajab 1407 A.H.).

4 Ibn Bābuwayh: *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh* 2/195; Al-Barqī: *al-Mahāsīn* p. 362 (with a slight variation); *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 8/325.

وروي أن البر موكلته صالح، والبحر موكل به حمزة.

It is reported that Ṣālīḥ is appointed over the land and Ḥamzah is appointed over the ocean.¹

Who is Ṣālīḥ and who is Ḥamzah? In *al-Khiṣāl* of Ibn Bābuwayh, there appears a narration which defines the personality of Ṣālīḥ for us. It reads as follows:

و من ضل منكم في سفر و خاف علي نفسه فليناد يا صالح أغثني، فإن في إخوانكم من الجن جنيا يسمي صالح يسبح في البلاد لمكانكم محتسبا نفسه لكم، فإذا سمع الصوت أجاب و أوشد الضال منكم و حبس عليه دابته.

He who goes astray on a journey and fears upon himself should call out, “O Ṣālīḥ! Help me!” Amongst your Jinn brothers there is a jinn by the name of Ṣālīḥ who, with the hope of reward, traverses all the cities in order to guide you. So when he hears the voice he responds, guides the stray among you, and holds the reigns of his animal.²

They have ostensibly inherited this from the people of the era of the first ignorance, for this was part of their culture as is alluded to in the following verse of Qur’ān:

وَأَنَّهُ كَانَ رِجَالٌ مِّنَ الْإِنسِ يَعُوذُونَ بِرِجَالٍ مِّنَ الْجِنِّ فَزَادُوهُمْ رَهَقًا

And verily there were men that would seek the refuge of Jinns. Thus they increased them in anxiety.³

The scholars write: it was the wont of the Arabs in the days of ignorance that when they would halt at a place they would seek the refuge of a notable jinn so that he does not afflict them with any evil; just as when they would enter the territories

1 *Man Lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* 2/195; *al-Mahāsin*: p. 362; *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 8/325.

2 *Al-Khiṣāl* 2/618; *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 8/325.

3 *Sūrah al-Jinn*: 6.

of the enemies they would seek the refuge and amnesty of a respectable person. When the Jinns saw that the humans are seeking their refuge due to fear they increased them in their anxiety, fear and terror till eventually they became more fearful than they were before. Qatādah says, “‘They increased them in anxiety’ means that the Jinns’ insolence increased against them... so when they would seek the refuge of the jinn they would harass them and make them feel more anxious.”¹

After the advent of Islam they sought the refuge of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى alone and abandoned the Jinn.² Which implies that seeking refuge from the jinn is seeking refuge from those besides Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.³

وَأِنْ يَمْسَسْكَ اللَّهُ بِضُرٍّ فَلَا كَاشِفَ لَهُ إِلَّا هُوَ وَإِنْ يُرِدْكَ بِخَيْرٍ فَلَا رَادَّ لِفَضْلِهِ يُصِيبُ بِهِ مَنْ يَشَاءُ
مِنْ عِبَادِهِ وَهُوَ الْغَفُورُ الرَّحِيمُ

If Allah inflicts upon you hardship there is none that can remove it save Him. And if He intends good for you then there is none that can reverse His favour. Allah grants it to whomsoever He wishes from His bondsmen. And verily He is the Very Forgiving the Most Merciful.⁴

1 *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 4/455; *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 29/108; *Fath al-Qadīr* 5/305. The same has been narrated in the *Tafsīr* books of the Shī‘ah as well. Refer to: *al-Burhān* 4/391; *Tafsīr al-Qummī*; *Tafsīr al-ṣāfi* 5/235; *Tafsīr Shibr* p. 535.

2 *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 29/109

3 *Kitāb al-Tawhīd* p. 175.

4 *Sūrah Yūnus*: 107.

Discussion Seven

Istikhārah in ways That Resemble the Divination of the Days of Ignorance

In their era of ignorance the Arabs would, when intending to journey or wage war or do anything else, spin arrows in order to divine the future. They would use three arrows; upon the first would be written “Do”, upon the other would be written “Don’t” and the third would be blank. Some say that upon one there would be written, “My Lord has commanded me”, upon the other, “My lord has prohibited me,” and the third would be empty. Hence, they would spin these arrows and if the “Do” arrow appeared they would go ahead, if the “Don’t” arrow appeared they would resist and if the empty arrow appeared they would repeat.¹

A multitude of people had been affected by divination by way arrows just as they had been affected by erecting idols and worshipping them; Anṣāb is primarily the worship of others besides Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and Azlām is fortune telling and seeking that knowledge which is the exclusive domain of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. In essence, the former is for practice and the latter is for knowledge. And the religion of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is in complete contrast to both of them.

Now, the Twelver Shī‘ah have made Istikhārah by way of arrows part of their religion and they have made a few additions to it as well which they name *al-Riqā’*. Therefore, we see that al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī has established a chapter named, ‘chapter regarding the commendableness of Istikhārah with *al-Riqā’* and its method’.² In this chapter he has cited five narrations. As for al-Majlisī, he has mentioned many different ways in which this Istikhārah can be done; he has established three chapters in this regard, ‘chapter regarding Istikhārah with

1 *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 2/12; *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 9/510

2 *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 5/208-213

al-Riqā',¹ 'chapter regarding Istikhārah with *Banādiq*'² and 'chapter regarding Istikhārah with *Subḥah* and *Ḥaṣā'*'.³

The method of doing all these different types of Istikhārah (as the books of the Shī'ah elucidate) although might slightly differ from the ways of the people of ignorance in terms of them containing a ṣalāh and a supplication—a ṣalāh which is performed in an innovated way and a special supplication—but their end result is no different than the practice of the ignorant era, i.e. in terms of divining good by moving the beads of Tasbīḥ (without recitation) or writing "Do" and "Don't" on pieces of paper and doing that a few times.

An example of this is the narration documented by al-Kulaynī,⁴ al-Ṭūsī,⁵ al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī⁶ and others⁷ which Hārūn ibn Khārijah reports from Abū ʿAbd Allāh. It reads as follows:

إذا أردت امرا فنخذ ست رقاع فاكتب في ثلاث منها: بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم خيرة من الله العزيز الحكيم
لفلان بن فلانة افعل، وفي ثلاث منها: بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم خيرة من الله العزيز الحكيم لفلان بن فلانة
لا تفعل، ثم ضعها تحت مصلاك، ثم صل ركعتين، فإذا فرغت فاسجد سجدة وقل فيها مائة مرة: أستخير الله
برحمته خيرة في عافيه، ثم استو جالسا وقل: اللهم خلني واختلني في جميع أموري، في يسر منك وعافية، ثم
استو جالسا وقل: ثم اضرب بيدك إلي الرقاع فشوشها وأخرج واحدة واحدة، فإن خرج ثلاث متواليات
افعل. فافعل الأمر الذي تريده، وإن خرج ثلاث متواليات لا تفعل فلا تفعله، وإن خرجت واحدة افعل
والاخرى لا تفعل فاخرج من الرقاع الي خمس فانظر أكثرها فاعمل به ودع السادسة لا تحتاج اليها

When you intend to do anything take six pieces of paper and write in three of them, "In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful. This is seeking of goodness for so and so the son of such and such a lady from the All

1 *Biḥār* 91/226-234

2 *Ibid* 91/235-240

3 *Ibid* 91/247-251

4 *Al-Furū' min al-Kāfi* 1/131

5 *Al-Tahdhīb* 1/306

6 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 5/208

7 *Al-Muqni'ah* p. 36; *al-Miṣbāḥ* p. 372

Powerful, the Most Wise; do”. And in the other three write, “In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful. This is seeking of goodness for so and so the son of such and such a lady¹ from the All Powerful, the Most Wise; don’t”. Thereafter place them under your prayer mat and read two raka‘āts of ṣalāh. After having performed the ṣalāh do a long Sajdah and say the following a hundred times therein, “I seek goodness from Allah ﷻ through his grace, goodness without any hardship.” Then sit upright and say the following, “O Allah choose good for me and decide the best for me in all my affairs with ease and well-being.” Then take the pieces of paper mix them up and choose one. Do this three times. If three “Do” pieces emerge consecutively go ahead and do what you intend. And if the three “Don’t” pieces appear consecutively do not desist from doing what you intend. And if one “Do” and one “Don’t” emerge then continue drawing till you have drawn five pieces. See which one is more and practice accordingly. Leave the sixth for you will not need it.

As for seeking good with lumps of sand (*Banādiq*), it is explained as follows:

انو الحاجة في نفسك ثم اكتب رعتين في واحدة لا، وفي واحدة نعم، واجعلهما في بندقتين من طين، ثم صل رعتين واجعلهما في ذيلك و قل: أني أشاورك في أمري هذا و انت خير مستشار و مشير فأشر علي مما فيه صلاح و حسن عاقبة، ثم ادخل يدك فإن كان فيها نعم فافعل، وإن كان فيها لا، لا تفعل .

Make an intention of the need you have in your heart. Then take two pieces of paper and write on one of them, “Yes,” and on the other, “No.” Place each of them into two lumps of sand. Thereafter, read two raka‘āts of ṣalāh, place them under your garment and say, “O Allah ﷻ I seek your council in this issue of mine; you are the best of those whose council is sought and the best adviser. Hence, guide me to that which is good and will have a pleasant result.” Subsequently, put your hands in the lumps; if it is “Yes” then go ahead and if it is “No” then do not.²

1 The attribution is to the mother. Whereas Allah ﷻ says:

ادْعُوهُمْ لِآبَائِهِمْ

Call them by their fathers.

2 *Al-Furū‘ min al-Kāfi* 1/132; *Al-Tahdhīb* 1/306; *Wasā’il al-Shīrah* 5/209.

Likewise their narrations also state that:

استخارة مولانا أمير المؤمنين وهي أن تضمير ما شئت و تكتب هذه الاستخارة و تجعلهما في مثل البندق و يكون بالميزان و تضعهما في إناء فيه ماء و يكون علي ظهر إحداهما افعل و الاخرى لا تفعل فأيهما طلع علي وجه الماء فافعل به، ولا تخالفه

The Istikhārah of Amīr al-Mu'minīn is that you should conceal your intention and then write this Istikhārah (the above mentioned). Follow this by placing them in lumps of soil—which should be weighed with a scale.¹ Take the lumps and place them into two separate containers; write on one of them, “Do” and on the other “Don’t”. Whichever of the two lumps appears first to the surface of the water follow it and do not go against it.²

It goes without doubt that Amīr al-Mu'minīn عليه السلام 'Alī was free from the blemishes of the ignorant era and its superstitions and that this is something that the Shī'ah have forged against him. Therefore, we find that this is not narrated by anyone besides them.

With regard to Istikhārah with *al-Subḥah* and *al-Ḥaṣā* (pebbles), their Shaykh al-Majlisī has written the following:

سمعت والدي يروي عن شيخه البهائي... انه كان يقول: سمعنا مذاكرة عن مشايخنا عن القائم صلوات الله عليهم في الاستخارة بأسبحة أنه يأخذها، و يصلي علي النبي وآله صلوات الله عليهم ثلاث مرات، و يقبض علي السبحة، و يعد اثنتين اثنتين، فإن بقيت واحدة فهو افعل، وإن بقيت اثنتان فهو لا تفعل

I heard my father narrate the following from his teacher al-Shaykh al-Bahā'ī... We have heard the following from our teachers (merely by way of revision) who narrate from the Mahdī regarding Istikhārah with a Tasbīḥ. He should take it and send salutations upon Nabī صلوات الله عليه وآله and his household three times and then hold the Tasbīḥ and count two beads at a time. If, at the end, one bead remains its positive and if two remain its negative.³

1 This is the explanation given by al-Majlisī in *Al-Biḥār* 91/239.

2 *Biḥār* 91/238

3 Ibid

All these divinations have their roots in the pre-Islamic era of ignorance. The Shī'ah have tried to give it an Islamic image.

Whereas, Allah ﷻ has ordered the believers—when they are two-minded in their matters—to seek his council by worshipping him and imploring him for goodness in affairs that they intend. As is narrated by Imām Aḥmad and Imām Bukhārī, and the authors of the *Sunan* collections on the authority of Jābir ibn 'Abd Allāh رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. He narrates the following:

كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يعلمنا الإستخارة كما يعلمنا السورة من القرآن. يقول: إذا هم أحدكم بالأمر فليركع ركعتين من غير الفريضة ثم ليقل: اللهم إني أستخيرك بعلمك وأستقدرك بقدرتك وأسألك من فضلك العظيم فإنك تقدر ولا أقدر وتعلم ولا أعلم وأنت علام الغيوب...

Rasūlullāh ﷺ would teach us Istikhārah just as he would teach us a chapter from the Qur'ān. He would say, "When any of you intend to do something he should read two raka'āts of optional prayer and then supplicate thus, "O Allah, I seek goodness from you due to your knowledge and I seek the ability from you due to your might and I ask you due to your immense grace. For verily, you are capable and I am not, you know and I do not and you are the possessor of the knowledge of the unseen..."¹

Surprisingly, this form of Istikhārah has been narrated in the books of the Shī'ah with exactly the same words as the above narration which appears in the canonical ḥadīth source texts of the Muslims (the Ahl al-Sunnah)². However, the doctrine of Taqiyyah which is one of the primary stimuli in distancing the Shī'ah from concurring with the majority compelled some of the Shī'ah scholarship to give preference to Istikhārah with al-Riqā' over everything else with the lame pretext that this was the isolated practice of a group who digressed from the way of Muṣṭafā ﷺ, referring to the Ahl al-Sunnah. This is because any of

1 *Al-Bukhārī* 2/51: under the chapters regarding nocturnal prayer, 8/168: chapter regarding the Āyah Say he is the most powerful; *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* 2/187-188; *Sunan al-Tirmidhī* 2/349; *Sunan al-Nasā'ī* 6/80-81; *Sunan Ibn Mājah* 1/440; *Sunan Aḥmad* 3/344.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 91/265; *Makārim al-Akhlaq* p. 372.

their narrations which are in complete harmony with the stance of the majority becomes problematic for the Shī'ah in terms of practice due to there being the possibility of Taqiyyah, according to their paradigm. Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī states:

وقد رجح ابن طاووس العمل باستخارة الرقاع بوجوه كثيرة منها... أنها تحتمل التقية لأنه لم ينقله أحد من العامة.

Ibn Ṭā'ūs has given various reasons for why Istikhārah with al-Riqā' is preferred. Among them... There is no possibility of it being narrated by way of Taqiyyah for none of the common populace (the Ahl al-Sunnah) have narrated it.¹

This is acknowledgement on their path that none of the Ahl al-Sunnah has narrated Istikhārah with al-Riqā'.

Furthermore, it seems as if Istikhārah with al-Riqā' troubled some of their scholars who felt it was rather something very odd. Hence, one of them says:

وأما الرقاع وما يتضمن افعّل ولا تفعل ففي حيز الشذوذ.

As for al-Riqā' and the “do” and “don’t” that it contains, it falls in the realm of odd practices.²

Not forgetting that he has even criticized its chain of transmission.³

This opinion of his, nevertheless, did not resonate well with the later Shī'ah who discarded it saying:

إنه لا مأخذ له مع اشتهاها بين الأصحاب وكيف تكون شاذة وقد دونها المحدثون في كتبهم والمصنفون في مصنفاتهم.

1 Wasā'il al-Shī'ah 5/211

2 Ja'far ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ḥillī (d 676 A.H.). He is titled *al-Muḥaqqiq* by the Shī'ah.

3 Their scholar Ibn Idrīs states, “It is a very rare narration because it has been narrated by the Faḥiyyah who are worthy of being cursed. E.g. the likes of Zur'ah and Samā'ah. (*Biḥār* 91/287).”

This opinion has no basis especially when it is popularly known among the learned scholars. How can it be an odd practice when the scholars of ḥadīth have documented it in their collections, the authors have mentioned it in their books.¹

They further claim that one of their scholars has compiled a voluminous book regarding the various types of Istikhārah.² In this book, he considers the narration of Istikhārah with al-Riqā' as reliable and makes mention of the weird and strange effects that it has.³ Thus they assert that only a select few have rejected it but their rejection does not hold much weight due to them being in the minority.⁴

This was the detailed elucidation regarding Istikhārah with al-Riqā', al-Banādiq, al-Subḥāh and al-Ḥaṣā together with the dispute around them. These are without a doubt in complete conformity with the manner in which the polytheist would do Istikhārah, i.e. “Do” and “Don’t”. The only difference is that they have added to it a ṣalāh and a supplication; and some narrations specify that the Istikhārah should be done by the grave of Ḥusayn⁵, which makes the Shirk even more clear. This is an innovation exclusive to this cult which has made them attached to it, and base their planning around, that to which the arrows guide them.

Whereas Allah ﷻ says:

1 *Biḥār* 91/288.

2 His name is Raḍī ibn Ṭā'ūs al-Hasanī.

3 *Biḥār* 91/288.

4 The Shī'ah have differed as to who was the first of their scholars to reject it. Shaykh al-Shahīd claims that no one besides Ibn Idrīs and those who followed suit like al-Shaykh Najm al-Dīn rejected it. (*Biḥār* 91/288).

However, al-Majlisī claims that al-Mufīd was the first to reject it. After citing the narration he mentions, “This is a very odd narration... we have mentioned it to reveal its status of permissibility not so that any one should practice upon it.” Then came along the later scholars who claimed that no such statement was made by al-Mufīd; someone had included it in his book without it being from him. (*Biḥār* 101/285). This is also proof that they change the books of their scholars.

5 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 5/220; *Biḥār* 101/285.

حُرِّمَتْ عَلَيْكُمُ الْمَيْتَةُ وَالدَّمُ إِلَى قَوْلِهِ وَأَنْ تَسْتَقْسِمُوا بِالْأَزْلَامِ

“Carrion and blood have been prohibited for you” until Allah says, “and that you divine by way of arrows.”¹

The meaning of which is abundantly clear that O you who believe, Allah ﷻ has made it forbidden that you divine by way of arrows.² Istiqsām literally means to seek a lot or a share through the medium of arrows. Ibn ‘Abbās رضى الله عنه says, “Azlām are arrows by way of which they would determine their affairs”³ i.e. the knowledge of that which has been apportioned for them.⁴

Likewise Allah ﷻ says:

ذَلِكُمْ فِسْقٌ

That is sinful.

In other words, practicing divination is sinful, misguidance, ignorance, and ascribing partners to Allah ﷻ.

These Rawāfiḍ in these variant Istikhārahs of theirs have followed the path of the polytheists and they have given preference to divination⁵ over the method of Istikhārah prescribed by the Sharī‘ah. Solely because of its exclusivity to their creed, which according to them is a sign of its authenticity. They have in a similar manner made it mandatory upon their followers to follow the result of the divination and have warned against opposing it.⁶ It is as if they believe that

1 Sūrah al-Mā‘idah: 3

2 Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 2/12

3 Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 6/78

4 Ibn al-Qayyim: Ighāthah al-Lahafān 1/227

5 Al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī: al-‘Iqāz min al-Haj‘ah: p. 3, 71-71

6 “And if he finds all of them to be “Don’t” he should be wary of not going against them.” (Biḥār al-Anwār 91/288

it brings knowledge from Allah ﷻ. And this is exactly what the polytheists would do. Ibn al-Qayyim رَحِمَهُ اللهُ says, “Divination is that they would compel themselves to practice on that which the arrows commanded them to do as is the case when taking an oath...”¹

So how is it possible for a Shīʿī to claim that the result of these pieces of paper with which he seeks good is the precisely the decree of Allah ﷻ. Did he somehow become aware of the unseen or does he have a promise by Allah (that he will be informed)? These pieces of paper compel him to do something or not to do it without any sound evidence or proof, as was the condition of the polytheist. And maybe there is no disparity whatsoever between that and between the saying of the astrologist, “Do not travel due to this star or that star.” Allah ﷻ says:

وَمَا تَدْرِي نَفْسٌ مَّاذَا تَكْسِبُ غَدًا

No souls knows what it will earn the next day.²

Whereas the Shīʿah continue to base their decisions on the outcome of pebbles and inanimate entities.

1 *Ighāthah al-Lahafān* 1/227

2 *Sūrah Luqmān*: 34. This discussion is taken from *Ighāthah al-Lahafān* 1/227

Chapter Two

Their Beliefs Regarding the Oneness of Allah in Terms of Him Being the Rabb

The Oneness of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى in terms of him being the *Rabb* (nourisher) entails that the attributes: Ownership, creation, and planning of the universe, only be ascribed to Him. A servant should believe that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى alone is the creator, sustainer, giver of life, giver of death, causer of benefit and harm, sovereign owner and planner. To Him alone belongs the power of creation and the authority of rule. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

أَلَا لَهُ الْخَلْقُ وَالْأَمْرُ تَبَارَكَ اللَّهُ رَبُّ الْعَالَمِينَ

Behold! To him belongs creation and the authority of rule. Blessed is Allah the Lord of the universe.¹

In another verse Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

وَلِلَّهِ مُلْكُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَإِلَى اللَّهِ الْمَصِيرُ

And for Allah is the kingdom of the heavens and the earth. And to him is the return.²

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has no partner and no equal.

The theme of the discussion is not studying this principle. Rather it is the study of the Shī'ī doctrine in this regard and an inquiry into whether this principle has been affected due to the Shī'ī belief regarding their Imāms.

1 Sūrah al-A'rāf: 54

2 Sūrah al-Nūr: 42

The Qur’ān has mentioned that the polytheists from among the Quraysh, together with their disbelief in Allah ﷻ and ascribing partners to him in worship, believed that He was the Creator and the Sustainer. Allah ﷻ says:

وَلَئِنْ سَأَلْتَهُمْ مَنْ خَلَقَهُمْ لَيَقُولُنَّ اللَّهُ

If you were to ask them who created them they would most certainly say Allah.¹

Likewise he says:

قُلْ مَنْ يَرْزُقُكُمْ مِنَ السَّمَاءِ وَالْأَرْضِ أَمَّنْ يَمْلِكُ السَّمْعَ وَالْأَبْصَارَ وَمَنْ يُخْرِجُ الْحَيَّ مِنَ الْمَيِّتِ وَيُخْرِجُ الْمَيِّتَ مِنَ الْحَيِّ وَمَنْ يُدَبِّرُ الْأَمْرَ فَسَيَقُولُونَ اللَّهُ فَقُلْ أَفَلَا تَتَّقُونَ

Say: “Who provides for you from the sky and the earth? Or who owns the ears and the eyes? And who extracts the living from the dead and the dead from the living? And who plans all matters?” They will reply: Allah. Say, “Do you not then fear?”²

Despite this, they ascribed partners to Allah ﷻ in worship. Hence Allah ﷻ says:

وَمَا يُؤْمِنُ أَكْثَرُهُمْ بِاللَّهِ إِلَّا وَهُمْ مُشْرِكُونَ

And the majority of them do not believe in Allah but that they ascribe partners to him.³

Mujāhid comments:

Their Īmān in Allah ﷻ refers to their statement, “Allah created us, nourishes us and gives us death.” So this is their Īmān in Allah which is accompanied by ascribing partners to Allah ﷻ in worship.⁴

1 Sūrah al-Zukhruf: 87

2 Sūrah Yūnus: 31

3 Sūrah Yūsuf: 106

4 Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 231/77-78; Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 2/532

So are the Shī'ah more intense in their heresy than these polytheists?

Scholars have mentioned that belief in Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى as the soul creator and nourisher is intrinsic to human nature and that polytheism in this regard (in the sense of believing in two creators who are identical in their attributes and doings) has not been professed by any cult or creed throughout history. Only a few idolaters have held the opinion that there exists a creator who created only some of the universe.¹

And therefore the question: Has this principle been affected in the Shī'ī dogma? I.e. in the sense that they are guilty of partially ascribing partners to Allah due to the importance they accord their Imāms, the attributes they ascribe to them, and the titles they confer upon them?

This will become evidently clear after analysing the narrations and reports which feature in their canonical works with regards to their Imāms. In this regard I shall present five discussions:

1. Their claim that Rabb is the Imām.
2. Their belief that this world and the afterlife both belong to the Imām.
3. Their belief that the formation of clouds and the thundering of lightening is due to the order of the Imām (I have named this discussion: Attributing cosmic occurrences to the Imām)
4. Their claim that a portion of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى incarnated into the Imām.
5. Their claim that the Imām can benefit and harm.

Similarly, under the chapter regarding the fundamentals of Īmān there will come a discussion on their belief regarding *Qadr* (predestination) and that a person gives existence to his actions; this also amounts to ascribing a partner to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى in terms of him being the Rabb. I have left this discussion to be covered there so that we can have a more holistic view of their fundamentals of Īmān.

1 *Majmū' al-Fatāwā* 3/96-97; *Sharḥ al-'Aqīdah al-Ṭahāwīyyah* p. 17-18

Discussion One

Their belief that Rabb is their Imām

It appears in their narrations that ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ allegedly said, “I am the lord of the land due to whom it remains stable.”¹

Look at their audacity and fanaticism Is not Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى alone the Mighty Lord of the earth, is it not him who created the heavens and the earth, and is the one that is upholding them.

إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُمَسِّكُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضَ أَنْ تَزُولَا وَلَئِنْ زَالَتَا إِنْ أَمْسَكَهُمَا مِنْ أَحَدٍ مِنْ بَعْدِهِ

Allah withholds the heavens and the earth from moving. If they ever move there will be none to withhold them besides him.²

Yet they ascribe to their Imām that he said, “I am the sovereign of the land,” i.e. the ruler of the land. And they further claim that the Imām is meant in the verse:

وَأَشْرَقَتِ الْأَرْضُ بِنُورِ رَبِّهَا

And the earth eliminated with the light of its lord.³

Likewise they say that:

أَمَّا مَنْ ظَلَمَ فَسَوْفَ نُعَذِّبُهُ ثُمَّ يُرَدُّ إِلَىٰ رَبِّهِ فَيُعَذِّبُهُ عَذَابًا نَكِرًا

As for him who oppresses, we shall soon punish him. Thereafter, he will be returned to his Lord who will afflict upon him a severe torment.⁴

1 *Mir'āt al-Anwār* p. 59. He quotes from *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* of al-Ṣaffār.

2 *Sūrah al-Fāṭir*: 41

3 *Sūrah al-Zumar*: 69

4 *Sūrah al-Kahf*: 87

They claim the oppressor will be brought before ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ who will afflict him with a severe torment.¹

Similarly they claim:

وَلَا يُشْرِكُ بِعِبَادَةِ رَبِّهِ أَحَدًا

And he does not ascribe in the worship of his Lord anyone.

It is reported in *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* that this refers to submission to ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and that one may not consider an unworthy and inapt person to be his partner in authority.² This is also reported in *Tafsīr al-Qummī*.³

Do not assume that these interpretations are due to the word Rabb being in the meaning of owner or master, because these verses are so explicit regarding Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى as the Rabb that they cannot bear any other meaning. The genitive construction has only made the word Rabb definite and specific.

Furthermore the scholars of language have written that when the word Rabb appears with a ال, thus its purport becomes specific to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

Names and attributes are of two types: One type is those names which are exclusive to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, e.g. names like *al-Ilāh* (God), *Rabb al-‘Ālamīn* (Sustainer of the Universe), and other names of this nature. These cannot be used for a servant at all. It is in this type that the polytheists have faltered and have considered others to be equal to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.

The second type is those attributes and names which can, to a certain extent, be attributed to the servant, e.g. *al-Ḥayy* (the living), *al-‘Ālim* (the

1 *Mir’āt al-Anwār* p. 59 with reference to *Kanz al-Fawā’id*.

2 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/353; *al-Burhān* 2/497; *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 3/270.

3 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/47

knower), *al-Qādir* (the capable). In this case, it would be necessary not to attribute these qualities to the creation in the same level as it is attributed to Allah ﷻ.¹

However these people have named their Imām “*al-Rabb*” (which is a name exclusive to the being of Allah ﷻ) due to their unceasing interpretations.

These interpretations were concocted by an irreligious imposter who intended to avert the Shīʿah away from their Lord, and unsurprisingly we find followers among the Shīʿah who have consumed from this stagnant contaminated pool of water, which is preserved within the canonical works of the Twelver Shīʿah.

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/342

Discussion Two

Their Belief That This World and the Afterlife Both Belong to the Imām.

The author of *al-Kāfī* has established a chapter by the name, ‘chapter regarding the earth being the soul property of Imām’. One of the narrations which appear therein reads thus:

عن أبي بصير عن أبي عبد الله عليه السلام قال: أما علمت أن الدنيا و الآخرة للإمام يضعها حيث يشاء ويدفعها إلي من يشاء جائز له ذلك من الله.

Abū Baṣīr narrates from Abū ‘Abd Allāh, “Do you not know that the world and the afterlife are the properties of the Imām. He can operate as he desires and can confer either of them upon whomsoever he wishes. This is the permission granted to him by Allah.”¹

Does this not amount to equating the Imām to Allah in his authority as the Rabb? Because Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

أَلَمْ تَعْلَمْ أَنَّ اللَّهَ لَهُ مُلْكُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ

Do you not know that for Allah alone is the kingdom of the heavens and the earth?²

وَلِلَّهِ مُلْكُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَمَا بَيْنَهُمَا وَإِلَيْهِ الْمَصِيرُ

For Allah is the kingdom of the heavens and the earth and whatever is between them and to Him is the return.³

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/409

2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 107

3 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 18

لِلَّهِ مُلْكُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَمَا فِيهِنَّ

For Allah is the dominion of the heavens and the earth and whatever is within them.¹

الَّذِي لَهُ مُلْكُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَلَمْ يَتَّخِذْ وَلَدًا وَلَمْ يَكُنْ لَهُ شَرِيكٌ فِي الْمُلْكِ

The One to Who belongs the dominion of the heavens and the earth; Who has no children and Who has no partner in kingdom.²

فَلِلَّهِ الْآخِرَةُ وَالْأُولَى

And for Allah is the next life and the first life.³

قُلْ مَنْ يَرْزُقُكُمْ مِّنَ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ قُلِ اللَّهُ

Say, “Who provides for you from the heavens and the earth?” Say, “It is Allah.”⁴

هَلْ مِنْ خَالِقٍ غَيْرِ اللَّهِ يَرْزُقُكُمْ مِّنَ السَّمَاءِ وَالْأَرْضِ

Is there any other creator besides Allah who is sustaining you from the heavens and the earth?⁵

فَابْتَغُوا عِندَ اللَّهِ الرِّزْقَ وَاعْبُدُوهُ وَاشْكُرُوا لَهُ

Search for sustenance by Allah, worship Him, and thank Him.⁶

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 120

2 Sūrah al-Furqān: 2

3 Sūrah al-Najm: 25

4 Sūrah al-Saba': 24

5 Sūrah al-Fāṭir: 3

6 Sūrah al-'Ankabūt: 17

How do the Shī'ah then claim abilities for their Imāms which no human has authority over and how do they accord their Imāms a characteristic which is from the necessary attributes of Allah ﷻ as the Rabb. They have no evidence in this regard besides that which the devils dictate and their irreligious write. Even more surprising is the fact that they attribute the kingdom, knowledge, rights, and actions of Allah ﷻ to their Imāms and then they say, "That is with the consent of Allah ﷻ and His approval." Is this not conveniently veiling their blasphemy? Or is it not an endeavour to conceal the prime objective of their devils which is to deify the Imāms and confer upon them the attributes of Allah?

Discussion Three

Attributing Cosmic Occurrences to the Imāms

Whatever happens in the cosmos is all because of the command of Allah ﷻ and His arrangement, in which he has no partner. However the books of the Shī'ah intrigue ones interest in this regard, for they have attributed some of the occurrences of the cosmos to their Imāms. Samā'ah ibn Mihrān narrates:

عن سماعة بن مهران قال: كنت عند أبي عبد الله عليه السلام فأرعدت السماء و ابرقت، فقال أبو عبد الله عليه السلام: أما إنه ما كان من هذا الرعد و من هذا البرق فإنه من أمر صاحبكم قلت: من صاحبنا؟ قال: أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام

Once I was in the company of Abū 'Abd Allāh and the sky thundered and emitted lightening. Thereupon Abū 'Abd Allāh said, "Behold all thunder and lightning is due to the order of your leader."

I enquired, "Who is our leader?"

He said, "Amīr al-Mu'minīn ﷺ".¹

This implies that all thunder and lightning is due to the order of Amīr al-Mu'minīn and not because of the order of Allah ﷻ, the One, the All Mighty.

What conclusion will an unbiased Muslim draw from this narration when Allah ﷻ says:

هُوَ الَّذِي يُرِيكُمُ الْبَرْقَ خَوْفًا وَطَمَعًا وَيُنشِئُ السَّحَابَ الثِّقَالَ

He is the one that shows you lightening which (at times) you fear and (at times) you have hope in and he is the one creates heavy clouds.²

1 al-Ikhtiṣāṣ p. 327; Biḥār al-Anwār 37/33; al-Burhān 2/482

2 Sūrah al-Ra'd: 112

Is this not the belief of the Saba'iyyah, which is raising its disfigured head in the books of the Twelvers? Is this not claiming that 'Alī عليه السلام is the Rabb or that he has some share in the operation of the universe? How bold of al-Majlisī, and al-Mufīd before him, to write such blasphemy and ascribe it to Imām Ja'far عليه السلام? For such heresy was plainly clear to them as well. Only a heretic and an irreligious person will believe in such doctrines. Indeed appalling is the affair of a people who procure their religion from books that contain such blasphemy, who revere scholars who openly professed such heresies. Is there no person of sound intellect and healthy religious propriety among this cult who can raise his voice and express his condemnation against this widespread misguidance, and who can exonerate the pure members of the Ahl al-Bayt from such devastating filth. Is there no one who will purify Shī'ism from the filth that the scholars of the Safawid era soiled it with?

Or is it that every sincere scholar who raises his voice is assassinated as they did with al-Kisrawī, or his opinion is interpreted as *Taqiyyah* (dissimulation) as they did with many of their narrations and opinions of their scholars. Has this dogma reached a stage where it has now become impervious to rehabilitation and the light of the truth?

I assume that the impressionable lay Shī'ah adherents perceive that there exists no other Islam out there but this. Because many factions of both Sunnī and Shī'ah have impressed upon them that there is no difference between the two save in a few secondary issues. Thus they shut the door of deliberation, investigation, and research upon them due to this grave widespread misunderstanding.¹

They also say that the clouds are the conveyance of 'Alī عليه السلام in which he rides as he desires. Their narrations state:

ما كان من سحب فيه رعد وصاعقة و برق فصاحبكم و صاعقة و برق فصاحبكم بركبه، أما أنه سيركب السحاب، و برق فيه الأسباب أسباب السماوات و الارضين السبع خمس عوامر و ثنتان خراب

1 Refer to the book: *Fikrah al-Taqrīb bayn al-Sunnah wa al-Shī'ah*

Any cloud that emits thunder, a storm, and lightening is ridden by your companion. Behold! He will ride the clouds and ascend the stories, the stories of the heavens and the earths. Five thereof are populated and two are empty.¹

This statement indirectly implies that ‘Alī عليه السلام drives the clouds which amounts to disbelief in the verse wherein Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى:

حَتَّىٰ إِذَا أَفَلَّتْ سَحَابًا ثِقَالًا سُقْنَاهُ لِبَلَدٍ مَّيِّتٍ فَأَنْزَلْنَا بِهِ الْمَاءَ

When they (the winds) have carried laden clouds we drive them to barren land and shower upon it water.²

Likewise the verse:

اللَّهُ الَّذِي يُرْسِلُ الرِّيَّاحَ فَتُثِيرُ سَحَابًا فَيَبْسُطُهُ فِي السَّمَاءِ كَيْفَ يَشَاءُ

Allah is the one that sends the winds which carry the clouds spreading them in the sky as he wishes.³

Their claim that “‘Alī عليه السلام rides the clouds” is an extension of the blasphemous belief of the Saba’iyyah belief, which was:

هو الذي يجيء في السحاب و الرعد صوته و البرق تبسمه

He is the one that appears in the clouds; the thunder is his voice, and the lightening is his smile.⁴

1 *Al-Ikhtisāṣ* p. 199, p. 327; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/32

2 *Sūrah al-A‘rāf*: 57

3 *Sūrah al-Rūm*: 48

4 *Al-Shahrastānī: al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* 1/173

Furthermore, al-Majlisī quotes a lengthy narration which consists of eight pages;¹ this narration accords ‘Alī عليه السلام supernatural abilities. To name a few:

- He can transfer his followers to places in the heavens and the earth,
- He can demonstrate before them miracles greater than the miracles of the prophets,
- He can destroy an entire nation with one slap.

The climax of it all is the claim:

إني لأملك من ملكوت السموات والأرض ما لا تحتملون العلم ببعضه

I own such entities from the kingdom of the heavens and the earth, the knowledge of which you cannot comprehend.

Al-Majlisī says about this narration:

أن علياً أو ما إليّ سحابتين فأصبحت كل سحابة كأنها بساط موضوع فركب عليّ سحابة بمفرده، وركب بعض أصحابه - كما تقول الرواية - كسلمان والمقداد... السحابة الأخرى، وقال عليّ وهو فوق السحابة: أنا عين الله في أرضه، أنا لسان الله الناطق في خلقه، أنا نور الله الذي لا يطفأ، أنا باب الله الذي يؤتي منه، وحجته عليّ عباده.

‘Alī pointed at two clouds. Each one thus became (flat) like a spread carpet. Thereafter, ‘Alī عليه السلام mounted one and some of his companions like Salmān and al-Miqdād mounted the other. He then said, “I am the eye of Allah on the earth, I am the speaking tongue of Allah in his creation, I am the light of Allah which will never be distinguished, I am the door to Allah wherefrom he should be approached, and I am his proof against his servants.”²

The narration continues in a very strange manner... The friends of ‘Alī عليه السلام ask him regarding the miracles of the Ambiyā’ whereupon he says:

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 27/34

2 Ibid.

أنا أريكم أعظم منها حتي قال: والذي فلق الحبة وبرأ النسمة إني لأملك من ملكوت السموت والأرض ما لو علمتمم بيعضه لما احتمله جناتكم، إن اسم الله الأعظم علي اثنين وسبعين حرفا، وكان عند آصف بن برخيا حرف واحد فتكلم به فخسف الله عز وجل ما بينه وبين عرش بلقيس حتي تناول السرير ثم عادت الأرض كما كانت أسرع من طرف النظر وعندنا نحن والله اثنان وسبعون حرفا وحرف واحد عند الله عز وجل استأثر به في علم الغيب.

I will show you greater than that. He said, “By the one who split the seed and created the soul I own from the kingdom of the heavens and the earth such things that if you were to learn of them your hearts would not be able to withstand them; the great name of Allah (*al-Isim al-A‘zam*) consists of seventy two letters. Āṣif ibn Barkhiyā possessed the knowledge of only one letter owing to which, Allah caused the earth between him and the throne of Bilqīs to sink in till he was able procure her throne. Subsequently, the earth returned to what it was in less than the blink of an eye. As for us, we have by the oath of Allah all seventy two letters, and one letter Allah has kept exclusive to himself in the realm of the unseen.”¹

This fairy tale goes onto mention that they, as they progressed, passed by some strange worlds wherein ‘Alī عليه السلام visited the Ambiyā’. Among them they saw a prophet who began crying when seeing Amīr al-Mu’minīn. And when he was asked as to the cause of his crying he said:

إن أمير المؤمنين كان يمر بي عند كل غداة فيجلس فتزداد عبادتي بنظري إليه فقطع ذلك منذ عشرة أيام فأفلقني ذلك.

Amīr al-Mu’minīn used to pass by and visit me every morning. My reward of devotion would increase due to looking at him. He has not visited me now for the last ten days, therefore, that put me into distress.²

The tale also mentions that ‘Alī عليه السلام told his friends, “Lower your gazes.” Thereafter he transported them to a city wherein the Bazaars were bustling and its people were taller than date-palms. He informed them that this is the people of ‘Ād. Then he stunned them and destroyed them.³

1 Ibid

2 Ibid

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/39

And the story continues... till eventually they return with the clouds carrying them. They land in the house of Amīr al-Mu'minīn in less than a blink of an eye. They report:

وكان وصولنا إلى المدينة وقت الظهر والمؤذن يؤذن، وكان خروجنا منها وقت علت الشمس.

We reached Madīnah at the time of the Ṣuḥr ṣalāh whilst the Mu'adhin was still calling out the adhān. Whereas we left just after the sun had risen up high.¹

Lastly Amīr al-Mu'minīn says:

لو أنني أردت أن أجوب الدنيا بأسرها والسموات السبع وأرجع في أقل من الطرف لفعلت بما عندي من اسم الله الأعظم، فقلنا: يا أمير المؤمنين أنت والله الآية العظمى والمعجز الباهر.

"If I want I can tour the entire world and the seven heavens and return in less than the winking of an eye because of the knowledge of the great name of Allah that I possess."

So we said, "O Amīr al-Mu'minīn! You are the greatest sign of Allah and his astounding miracle."²

This lengthy narration with all its flaws and problems has not been rejected by al-Majlisī despite his acknowledgement:

لم نره في الأصول التي عندنا. لا نردها ونرد علمها إليهم عليهم السلام

I have not seen it in our canonical works. We do not reject it, rather we consign its knowledge to the Imāms.³

Astonishing indeed! A narration which is not found in their mother-works and which consists of such inconceivable exaggerations, yet al-Majlisī did not have the courage to reject it. So what then about the ludicrous narrations which appear in their mother-works. They will be most certainly be overlooked and accepted.

1 Ibid

2 Ibid

3 Ibid

Discussion Four

A Divine Portion has Translocated into the Imāms

The Shī'ah have narrations which suggest that a fraction of Allah's Nūr translocated into 'Alī عليه السلام. Abū 'Abd Allāh says:

ثم مسحنا بيمينه فأفضي نوره فينا

Then we rubbed his right hand. His light thus permeated our existence.¹

و لكن الله خلطنا بنفسه

But Allah made us mingle with himself.²

This divine fraction which has translocated into their A'imma—as they claim—enabled them with supernatural abilities. Therefore, a person who reads what they term “the miracles of the A'imma” which are reported in hundreds of narrations will reach the conclusion that they are just like Allah سبحانه وتعالى, the Rabb of the universe (exalted is he from what they say) in terms of giving life and death, creating and sustaining.³ Yes, in order to mislead and confuse their narrations suggest that all of this happens by the command of Allah سبحانه وتعالى.

For example: 'Alī عليه السلام is the reviver of the dead. A narration from Abū 'Abd Allāh in *al-Kāfī* states the following:

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/440; *Ibid* 1/441-442

2 *Ibid* 1/435.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 'chapter regarding his ('Alī) comprehensive miracles' 42/17 (17 narrations), 'the chapter regarding his strange miracles' 42/5-56. They have even attributed such miracles to his grave which are exclusively the domain of Allah سبحانه وتعالى; the author of *Al-Biḥār* has established an entire chapter in this regard, 'chapter regarding the miracles that transpired at his tomb' 42/311-339. This is the case with all twelve of their Imāms. The sand of the grave of Ḥusayn عليه السلام, however, supersedes the miracles of the Imāms in that they have ascribed divine powers like sustaining, curing, and granting of well-being to it.

إن أمير المؤمنين له خؤولة في مخزوم و إن شابا منهم اتاه فقال: يا خالي إن أخي مات و قد خزنت عليه حزنا شديدا، قال فقال: تشتهي أن تراه؟ قال: بلي، قال فأرني قبره، قال فخرج و معه بردة رسول الله متزرا بها، فلما انتهى إلي القبر تلملمت شفتاه ثم ركضه برجله فخرج من قبره و هو يقول بلسان الفرس، فقال أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام: ألم تمت و أمت رجل من العرب؟ قال بلي، ولكننا متنا علي سنة فلان و فلان (أي أبو بكر و عمر) فانقلبنا ألسنتنا.

Amīr al-Mu'minīn had maternal relations in the Banū Makhzūm tribe. A youngster from among them came to him and said, "O my uncle my brother passed away and I am grieving immensely over his demise."

He said, "Do you desire to see him?" the youngster replied in the affirmative.

He then said, "Show me his grave."

Hence, he went whilst he was dressed in the shawl of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. When he reached the grave his lips moved after which he kicked the grave. And thus the dead man emerged from his grave speaking Persian. Amīr al-Mu'minīn said to him, "Did you not die as an Arab?" He said, "Yes. But because we died following the ways of so and so, and so and so (i.e. Abū Bakr and 'Umar) our tongues changed."¹

They claim that 'Alī رضي الله عنه revived the entire graveyard of al-Jabānah.² And when he struck a stone a hundred camels emerged.³

Salmān says (according to their fabrications):

لو أقسم أبو الحسن علي الله أن يحيي الأولين و الآخرين لأحياهم

If Abū al-Ḥasan takes an oath to revive the people of the past and the people still to come he will be capable of doing so.⁴

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/457; *Bihār al-Anwār* 41/192; *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* p. 76

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 41/194 with reference to *al-Kharā'ij wa al-Jarā'ih* which is not published as yet.

3 Ibid 41/198 with reference to *al-Kharā'ij wa al-Jarā'ih* which is not published as yet.

4 Ibid 41/201

Indeed they have procured these beliefs from the polytheist creeds which confer upon their idols that which is exclusive to Allah ﷻ. Merely envisioning such beliefs is sufficient in rendering them baseless. Because they are against the divine texts, rationality, the laws of nature, and the true state of the Imāms and their statements. Rasūlullāh ﷺ is instructed by Allah ﷻ to say:

قُلْ لَا أَمْلِكُ لِنَفْسِي نَفْعًا وَلَا ضَرًّا إِلَّا مَا شَاءَ اللَّهُ

Say, “I do not own for myself benefit nor harm save that which Allah wills.”¹

What is very interesting is that the Shī'ah despite revering the Imāms and exaggerating in their beliefs regarding them narrate the diametrically opposite of the aforementioned. This brings about plain contradiction in what they claim (This is the nature of every lie and falsehood). *Rijāl al-Kashshī* states that Imām Ja'far ibn Muḥammad said:

فو الله ما نحن الا عبيد الذي خلقنا واصطفانا، ما نقدر علي ضر ولا نفع، وإن رحمتنا فبرحمته، وإن عذبنا فبذنوبنا، والله ما لنا علي الله من حجة، ولا معنا من الله براءة وإنا لميتون ومقبورون ومنشورون ومبعوثون وموقوفون ومسؤولون، ويلهم ما لهم لعنتهم الله فقد اذوا الله واذوا رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم في قبره، وامير المؤمنين وفاطمة والحسن والحسين وعلي بن الحسين ومحمد بن علي صلوات الله عليهم...أشهدكم أنني امرؤ ولدني رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم وما معي براءة من الله إن أظعته رحماني، وإن عصيته عذبني عذابا شديدا

By Allah! We are but servants of the One Who created us and selected us. We are not able to benefit or harm. If we are shown mercy it is due to His grace and if we are punished it is due to our sins. By Allah! We have no guard against Allah and nor do we enjoy exoneration accorded to us by Him. We are going to die, be resurrected, made to stand before Allah and questioned. Woe be upon them! What is wrong with them? May Allah curse them. They have offended Allah, His Messenger who lies in his grave, Amīr al-Mu'minīn, Fāṭimah, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, and Muḥammad

1 Sūrah al-A'rāf: 188

ibn ‘Alī. I bear witness that I am a man from the progeny of Rasūlullāh ﷺ who enjoys no exoneration before Allah. If I obey Him He will show mercy to me and if I disobey Him He will punish me severely.”¹

However the scholars of the Shī‘ah consider such admissions of the Imāms to be nothing more than Taqiyyah² whereby they have misguided the people. And the creed of the Shī‘ah has thus become the creeds of their scholars and not the creed of the Imāms.

This belief of theirs (some illustrations of which were presented above) which claims that a divine portion translocated into the Imāms, has progressed according to some of their scholars; its implications have increased to the extent that there exists only one being who is the essence of all existence.³ They have considered it to be the highest form of belief in Tawḥīd as is propounded by their scholar al-Nirāqī.⁴

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 225-226

2 Refer to p 151 and the discussion of Taqiyyah coming ahead.

3 i.e. the existence of the creation is the very existence of Allah. (*Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā* 1/140).

4 Mahdī ibn Abī Dhar al-Kāshānī al-Nirāqī (d. 1209 A.H), *Al-Dharī‘ah* 5/58; *Jāmi‘ al-Sa‘ādāt* p. 132-133.

Discussion Five

Their Belief That Days and Nights Secure Benefit and Cause Harm

Allah ﷻ says:

وَمَا بِكُمْ مِنْ نِعْمَةٍ فَمِنَ اللَّهِ ثُمَّ إِذَا مَسَّكُمُ الضُّرُّ فَإِلَيْهِ تَجَاوُونَ

Whatever bounties you enjoy are all from Allah. Then when difficulty afflicts you it is Him that you beseech.¹

So benefit and harm is only from Allah ﷻ. Days and nights do not effect either of the two. However, the Shī'ah defy this by claiming that some days carry bad omen due to which a person's needs are not fulfilled. Abū 'Abd Allāh says:

لا تخرج يوم الجمعة في حاجة، فإذا كان يوم السبت و طلعت الشمس فاخرج في حاجتك

Do not leave for an errand on Friday. When Saturday comes and its sun rises then leave for your needs.²

He likewise said:

السبت لنا، والأحد لبني أمة

Saturday is for us and Sunday is for the Banū Umayyah.³

He also said:

فأي يوم اعظم شؤما من يوم الاثنين... لا تخرجوا يوم الاثنين واخرجوا يوم الثلاثاء

Is there any day which is more replete with bad-luck then Monday. Do not leave on Monday for you needs but leave of Tuesday.⁴

1 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 53

2 *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh* 1/95; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 8/253

3 *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh* 2/342; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 8/253

4 *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh* 1/95; *al-Rawḍah* p. 314; *al-Maḥāsin* p. 347; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 8/253; *al-Khiṣāl* 2/26.

He has also said:

لا تسافر يوم الاثنين ولا تطلب فيه حاجة

Do not travel on Monday and do not seek to fulfil your needs therein.¹

Just as he has said:

آخر أربعاء في الشهر يوم نحس مستمر

The last Wednesday of the month is a day of continuous misfortune.²

Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī (according to their fabrications) is reported to have said:

يوم السبت يوم مكر وخديعة و يوم الأحد يوم غرس وبناء، و يوم الاثنين يوم سفرو طلب، و يوم الثلاثاء يوم حرب و دم، و يوم الأربعاء يوم شؤم يتطير فيه الناس، و يوم الخميس يوم الدخول علي الامراء و قضاء الحوائج، و يوم الجمعة يوم خطبة و نكاح

Saturday is a day of ploy and deception. Sunday is a day of planting and building. Monday is a day of quest and journey. Tuesday is a day of war and bloodshed. Wednesday is a day of misfortune wherein people forebode. Thursday is a day of visiting the influential and fulfilling needs. And the day of Friday is a day of proposal and marriage.³

They have other narrations as well which purport the same meaning.⁴ The comprehensive understanding of these narrations entails that the days: Friday, Sunday, Monday, and Wednesday are days of ingrained misfortune. Hence a person should not fulfil his needs therein.

1 *Al-Maḥāsīn* p. 346; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 8/257

2 *Al-Khiṣāl* 2/27; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 8/257

3 *'Ilal al-Sharā'i* p. 199; *al-Khiṣāl* 2/28; *Uyūn al-Akhbār* p. 137; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 8/258.

4 Many of these narrations have been recorded in the books regarding forgeries (*al-Mawḍū'āt*). See: Ibn al-Jawzī: *al-Mawḍū'āt* p. 71-74; Ibn 'Irāq: *Tanzīh al-Sharī'ah al-Marfū'ah* 2/53-56; al-Shawkānī: *al-Fawā'id al-Majmū'ah* p. 437-438.

But if you noticed, the last narration suggests that Monday is a day of quest and journey. This opposes the narrations that passed. Therefore, their scholar al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī has interpreted this to be said in Taḳiyyah.¹

Based on this, all four days are days of misfortune according to the Shīʿah. Which leaves a Shīʿī with only three days in the week to do work.

This is a type of foreboding², i.e. pessimism generated due to certain days, birds, names, words and lands, etc. This phenomenon is from the practices of the people of ignorance and the polytheists. Allah ﷻ has condemned them and despised them in the Qurʾān. Rasūlullāh ﷺ has likewise prohibited us from foreboding (known as Taṭayyur), and informed us that it is tantamount to ascribing partners with Allah ﷻ. It cannot in any way effect procuring benefit or repelling harm and that it is from the whisperings of Shayṭān and his threats.

Allah ﷻ says:

أَلَا إِنَّمَا طَائِرُهُمْ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ وَلَكِنَّ أَكْثَرَهُمْ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ

Behold! Their misfortune is with Allah but most of them do not know.³

1 Wasā'il al-Shī'ah 8/258

2 The foreboding is the days of ignorance was where people would rely upon birds. If any of them would leave on an errand and would see the bird flying to the right he would consider it a good omen and continue his journey, and if it would fly to the left he would forebode evil and return. Some of them would actually incite the bird to fly. They would name these birds al-Sāniḥ and al-Bāriḥ. Al-Sāniḥ was the bird that would fly from a left of a person to his right and al-Bāriḥ was the bird that would fly from the right of a person to his left. They would derive good omen from the former and bad omen from the latter. (*Fatḥ al-Bārī* 10/212-213; *Lisān al-'Arab* 4/512)

Some have differentiated between bad omen (Ṭiyarah) and pessimism (Taṭayyur). Ṭiyarah they say is the evil thought that lingers in a person's mind and Taṭayyur is the bad that comes to being due to that evil thought. The author of 'Awn al-Ma'būd has attributed this to al-'Izz ibn 'Abd al-Salām. ('Awn al-Ma'būd 10/406).

3 Sūrah al-A'rāf: 131

‘Alī ibn Ṭalḥah narrates from Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه the following:

ألا إنما طرهم عند الله، يقول: مصائبهم عند الله ولكن أكثرهم لا يعلمون

The verse, “Behold! Their misfortune is with Allah,” implies that calamities befall them from Allah but most people do not know.

And Ibn Jarīr mentions that Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه would say that “Behold their misfortune is with Allah” means that it comes from Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.¹

Ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه narrates that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم said:

الطيرة شرك الطيرة شرك ثلاثا

“Foreboding is Shirk. Foreboding is Shirk.” He said this three times.²

This is unequivocal in the prohibition of foreboding due the heart therein being connected to others besides Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.³

Ibn Ḥajr رضي الله عنه says:

و إنما جعل ذالك شركا لا اعتقادهم أن ذالك يجلب نفعا أو يدفع ضرا فكانهم اشركوه مع الله تعالى

And this has been equated to Shirk because of their belief that it would procure for them benefit or repel from them harm. So it is as if they ascribed a partner to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.⁴

It is false claim meant to waste time, delay needs, turn the hearts of people away from Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى to creation that cannot benefit nor harm.

1 *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 2/257

2 *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, ‘chapter regarding foreboding’ 4/230; *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*, ‘chapter regarding foreboding’ 4/160-161. He has classified this narration as Ḥasan Ṣaḥīḥ; *Sunan Ibn Mājah* 2/1170; *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* narration no. 1427.

3 *Fatḥ al-Majīd* p. 361

4 *Fatḥ al-Bārī* 10/213; *Lisān al-‘Arab* 4/513

Nevertheless, there is no peculiarity that one will find in the books of the Shī'ah but that he will find within their own books narrations that contradict it. There are narrations that completely defy this belief. Usually the most effective debunking tool is the one done by the opponent against himself. The books of the Shī'ah report that Abū 'Abd Allāh said:

لا طيرة

There is no foreboding.¹

He also said:

كفارة الطيرة التوكل

The expiation of foreboding is relying upon Allah.²

Abū al-Hasan al-Thānī (al-Riḍā) says:

من خرج يوم الأربعاء.. خلافا علي أهل الطيرة وقي من كل افة و عوفي من كل عاهة و قضى الله له حاجته

That person who leaves on a Wednesday for a need (against the practice of the people of foreboding) will be saved from every calamity, will be granted relief from every difficulty and Allah will fulfil his need.³

Likewise there appears a narration which reads as follows:

إذا تطيرت فامض

When you sense a bad omen continue (and do not withdraw).⁴

1 *Rawḍah al-Kāfī* p. 196; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 8/262

2 *Rawḍah al-Kāfī* p. 198; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 8/262

3 *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh* 1/95; *al-Khiṣāl* 2/27

4 *Tuḥaf al-'Uqūl* p. 50

And there appears a narrations in *Al-Biḥār*:

أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم كان يحب الفأل، و يكره الطيرة، و كان عليه السلام يأمر من رأي شيئاً يكرهه، و يتطير منه أن يقول (اللهم لا يؤتني الخير إلا أنت ولا يدفع السيئات إلا أنت ولا حول ولا قوة إلا بك)

Nabī ﷺ loved good omens and despised bad omens. And when Rasūlullāh ﷺ would see something unpleasant due to which he would have a sense of foreboding he would say, “O Allah no one grants good but you, no one dispels evil but you and there is no resistance (from sinning) and no power (to do good) but through you.”¹

So this is wholesale contradiction. And contradiction is a sign of the invalidity of a creed. However, the principle of Taqiyyah and the opposition of the majority (Ahl al-Sunnah) prevent the Shī'ah from benefitting from such narrations. Hence, you see their scholar interpreting the narration of Monday being a day of Quest and it being a day of journey is considered Taqiyyah.

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 95/2-3; al-Ṭabarsī: *Makārim al-Akhlaq* p. 403

Chapter Three

Their Belief Regarding Allah's سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى Names and Attributes

There are four deviations of the Shī'ah in this regard:

1. The deviation of *Tajsīm* (anthropomorphism)
2. The deviation of the *Ta'ṭīl* (denying) of some of his names and attributes.
3. The deviation of ascribing the names of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and his attributes to the Imāms.
4. The deviation of *Tahrīf* (distortion) the verses of the Qur'ān due to the belief in the denial of the attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.

I shall endeavour to pause at each of these discussions and mention the doctrine of the Shī'ah with regards to them, Allah willing.

Discussion One

Tajsīm (Anthropomorphism)

The deviation of *Tajsīm* (anthropomorphism) was very common among the Jews.¹ However, the first among the Muslims to invent anthropomorphic beliefs regarding Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى were the Rawāfiḍ. Therefore al-Rāzī says:

1 In the Qur'ān there features proof to establish this. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

وقالت اليهود عزيز ابن الله

And the Jews said, "Uzair is the son of Allah."

In the current Old Testament (*Tawrāt*) there are many examples in this regard. E.g. And Adam and eve heard the sound of God as he was walking in the cool of the day. (*Genesis*: 3:8), "Then Moses Aron ascended... accompanied by seventy men of the Israelites. They saw the god of Israel and his feet was something like a pavement made of lapis lazuli [deep blue metamorphic rock], as bright as blue as the sky. (*Exodus*: 24:10.). There are many other examples of this nature refer to the following: *Genesis*: 32: 22; *Deuteronomy*: 34: 10; *Judges*: 6: 11; *Exodus*: 24: 4...

اليهود أكثرهم مشبهة و كان بدء ظهور التشبيه في الإسلام من الرواض مثل هشام بن الحكم و هشام بن سالم الجواليقي و يونس بن عبد الرحمن القمي و أبي جعفر الأحول

Most of the Jews are anthropomorphists. The beginning of anthropomorphism in Islam was with the Rawāfiḍ like Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam, Hishām ibn Sālim al-Jawālīqī, Yūnus ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Qummī and Abū Ja‘far al-Aḥwal.¹

All of the aforementioned are regarded by the Twelvers to be the forerunners among their scholars and authentic transmitters of their creed.²

Ibn Taymiyyah has identified the first person who was the proponent of this grave fallacy. He says:

وأول من عرف في الإسلام أنه قال إن الله جسم هو هشام بن الحكم

And the first person who is known to have claimed that Allah has a body is Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam.³

And al-Ash‘arī who preceded Ibn Taymiyyah asserts that the former Shī‘ah were all anthropomorphists. He then goes into the details of their variant views and quotes some of their statements in this regard. However, he says that some of the latter Shī‘ah were of the opinion of denying the attributes of Allah *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى* [known as Ta‘tīl].⁴

1 *I‘tiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn wa al-Mushrikīn* p. 97.

2 See: Muḥsin al-Amīn: *A‘yān al-Shī‘ah* 1/106. In the books of *Firaq* (heresiography) there is mention of sects that subscribed to views of these people. E.g. al-Ash‘arī says, “Al-Hishāmiyyah are the followers of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam... etc. (*Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/106) And “The Yūnusiyyah are the followers of Yūnus ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Qummī (Ibid 1/109). And “The Hishāmiyyah are the followers of Hishām ibn Sālim al-Jawālīqī (Ibid 1/109. The common factor among them all is Shī‘ism.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/20.

4 *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/106-109.

This tells us that denying the attributes of Allah ﷻ was something that transpired very early in the history of Shī'ism. The views regarding the stipulation of the era in which this transpired will be presented ahead.¹

The heresiographers have documented statements of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam which are drenched in anthropomorphism; such that they leave the believer's hair standing on end due to their blasphemous nature.

‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī says:

زعم هشام بن الحكم أن معبوده جسم ذو حد و نهاية و أنه طويل عريض عميق و أن طوله مثل عرضه

Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam claimed that his lord is a body with boundaries and limits, and that he has height, width, and depth. His height is just like his width.²

He also says:

إن هشام بن سالم الجواليقي مفرط في التجسيم و التشبيه لأنه زعم أن معبوده علي صورة الإنسان... و أنه ذو حواس خمس كحواس الإنسان وكذلك ذكر أن يونس بن عبد الرحمن القمي مفرط أيضا في باب التشبيه و ساق بعض أقواله في ذلك

Most certainly Hishām ibn Sālim al-Jawālīqī was an exaggerator in anthropomorphism and *Tashbīh* (likening Allah ﷻ to the creation) because he claimed that his lord has a humanly appearance... and that he possesses the five senses that humans possess.³ He also mentions that Yūnus ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Qummī was likewise an extremist in likening Allah to the creation and he quotes some of his verdicts in this regard.⁴

1 In the second discussion.

2 *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* p. 65.

3 Ibid p. 68-69.

4 Ibid p. 70.

Ibn Ḥazm mentions:

قال هشام إن ربه سبعة اشبار بشبر نفسه

Hishām said that the height of his lord is seven hand spans of his own hand.¹

Al-Asfarā'inī, after quoting the anthropomorphist views of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam and Hishām al-Jawālīqī, comments:

والعاقل بأول وهلة يعلم أن من كانت هذه مقالة لم يكن له في الإسلام حظ

An intelligent person at the first instance will recognise that any person bearing such opinions has no share in Islam whatsoever.²

The books of *Firaq* (Heresiography) are filled with the exaggerated anthropomorphist opinions of Hishām al-Ḥakam and his followers.³ Some of the books of the Mu'tazilah and the Zaydī Shī'ah also contain some of them. From amongst the Mu'tazilah al-Jāhīz has documented these beliefs; he says:

وتكلمت هذه الرافضة وجعلت له صورة وجسدا، وكفرت من قال بالرؤية علي غير التجسيم والتصوير،
وكذلك ابن الخياط، والقاضي عبد الجبار

These Rawāfiḍ have spoken and attributed a form and a body to him. They have thus dubbed as Kāfir any person who believes in seeing Allah ﷻ without a body and form.⁴

Likewise they have dubbed Ibn al-Khayyāṭ⁵ and al-Qāḍī 'Abd al-Jabbār⁶ as Kāfir.

1 *Al-Faṣl*, 5/40.

2 *Al-Tabṣīr fī al-Dīn* p. 24.

3 Refer to: al-Malaṭī: *al-Tanbīh wa al-Radd* p. 24; al-Shahrastānī: *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* 1/184, 187, 188; al-Saksakī: *al-Burhān* p. 41; Ibn Ḥajr: *Liṣān al-Mizān* 6/194; Maḥmūd al-Bishbīshī: *al-Firaq al-Islāmiyyah* p. 58; 'Alī Muṣṭafā al-Ghurābī: *Tārīkh al-Firaq al-Islāmiyyah* p. 300.

4 *Risālah al-Jāhīz fī Banī Umayyah* p. 19.

5 *Al-Intiṣār* p. 14.

6 *Tathbīt Dalā'il al-Nubuwwah* 1/225.

From among the Zaydī Shī'ah¹, Ibn al-Murtaḍā al-Yamānī has stated:

بأن جل الروافض علي التجسيم إلا من اختلط منهم بالمعتزلة

Most of the Shī'ah belief in anthropomorphism save those who mixed with the Mu'tazilah.²

So, likening Allāh سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى to the creation was part of Jewish belief. It then made its way to Shī'ism due to it being the abode of any person who intended to conspire against Islam and its adherents. The first to propound this belief was Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam;³ others after him, who are identified in the books of heresiography as spear-headers of deviant cults, followed in his footsteps.

However, we find that the scholars of the Twelvers have gone out of their way in trying to defend the position of these devious people, the reports of whose heresy has been largely transmitted and whose evil was immensely widespread. Hence, the Twelvers issue far-fetched interpretations of their statements or try to refute them completely.⁴

Al-Majlisī says:

و لعل المخالفين نسبوا إليهما هذين القولين معاندة

It is very possible that the opposition ascribe these views to them out of obstinacy.⁵

1 It should be remembered that the Zaydīs subscribe to the Mu'tazilite school of thought in theology. Hence al-Shahrastānī says, "As for theology, they subscribe to the school of the Mu'tazilah completely." (*Al-Milal wa al-Nihāl* 11/162; al-Muqbilī: *al-'Ilm al-Shāmikh* p. 319.

2 *Al-Munyah wa al-Amal* p. 19; Nashwān al-Ḥimyarī: *al-Ḥūr al-'Īn* p. 148-149.

3 See p 270 onwards of this book for more details (under the discussion of how the belief in the distortion of the Qur'ān of which Hishām was a proponent spread like wild fire in the Twelver dogma.)

4 *Bihār al-Anwār* 3/290-292.

5 Referring to Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam and Hishām ibn Sālim al-Jawālīqī.

I say that it is completely normal for the Shī'ah to deny this. For they are known to refute clear realities and believe in open lies and heresies. As for their defence of these devious people, it is something inherent in their culture which should not be considered strange. For they always try to defend their people. To the extent that some of them have specialised in defending the most uncharacteristic people whose evil is well-known and regarding whose deviance and heresy many traditions are reported. Whereas, astonishingly, they will go out of their way in criticising and dubbing as infidels those who are lauded by Allah ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ.

The objection could be raised that all the previous statements of Hishām and his followers were only cited from the books of the opposition, therefore, they cannot serve as evidence against the Shī'ah.

Although it is true that all these citations have been quoted from the books of heresiographers belonging to various schools and leanings who are more truthful than the Rāfiḍah in speech and much more reliable in transmission, and whose books have proven that the Rāfiḍah were the ones who introduced this heresy into Islam. However the statement that these accusations of anthropomorphism only appear in the books of their opposition and do not appear in any of the books of the Shī'ah might convince someone who reads only the refutations of the Shī'ah, whereas in reality the complete opposite is true.

For there are many narrations which feature in the mother-books of the Shī'ah which suggest that the theologians of the Shī'ah, the likes of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam, Hishām ibn Sālim al-Jawālīqī, and Yūnus ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Qummī did not merely suffice on establishing the attributes of Allah ﷻ as entailed in the Qur'an and the Sunnah, rather they exceeded that and went down the path of anthropomorphism.

It appears in *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī and *al-Tawḥīd* of Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī and other books that the Shī'ah were in major consternation in the year 255 A.H. because they engaged in the contention with regards to the form of Allah ﷻ.

Some opined that he had a form of some type whilst others asserted that he had a body. The narration that Shaykh al-Ṣadūq narrates from Sahl reads as follows

كتبت إلي أبي محمد قد اختلف يا سيدي أصحابنا في التوحيد منهم من يقول هو جسم، ومنهم من يقول هو صورة فإن رأيت يا سيدي أن تعلمني من ذلك ما أقف عليه ولا أجوزه فعلت متطولا علي عبدك؟ فوقع بخطه سألت عن التوحيد وهذا عنكم معزو، الله تعالى واحد أحد صمد لم يلد ولم يولد ولم يكن له كفوا أحد. خالق وليس بمخلوق بخلق تبارك وتعالى ما يشاء من الأجسام ويصور ما يشاء وليس بمصور، جل ثناؤه وتقدست أسماؤه، وتعالى أن يكون له شبيه هو لا غيره ليس كمثله شيء وهو السميع البصير.

I wrote to Abū Muḥammad in the year 255 A.H enquiring, “O my Master, our companions have debated regarding Allah. Some say that he has a body (*Jism*)¹ whilst others says that he owns a form. Would you deem it appropriate to inform me of something in this regard that I can learn and will not exceed. I shall comply diligently?

Hence he responded saying, “You have asked regarding Allah whereas he is aloof from you. He is one and alone, independent, he did not beget and nor was he begotten. There is no equal to him. He is the creator, not the created; he creates bodies which he intends and fashions forms which he desires, but himself does not possess any form. His praise is exalted and his names are sacred. He is free from an equal. There is nothing like him and he is the All Hearing and the All Seeing.”²

Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam and Hishām ibn Sālim al-Jawālīqī played a major role in the anthropomorphist leanings of the Shī‘ah as is alluded to in a number of their

1 The word Body (*Jism*) and others like it are invented words, the refutation or the establishment of which does not feature in the Qur’ān and the Sunnah. Therefore, the right path is not to assert these types of words nor to refute them. As for the meanings of these words, if the intended meaning is congruous with the truth it will be accepted and if it is incongruous with the truth it will be rejected. And if it is a hybrid of both, a detailed investigation will be required and the truth will have to be separated from the falsehood. (*Al-Tadmuriyyah* p. 65 (with the research of Muḥammad ‘Awdah al-Sa’ūdī); *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islam* 12/316-318: the meaning of *Jism* according to the theologians and debaters.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/103; *al-Tawḥīd* p. 101-102; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 3/261.

narrations. In *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* there appears a narration on the strength of Muḥammad ibn al-Faraj al-Rakhaḥī which states:

كُتِبَ إِلَيَّ أَبِي الْحَسَنِ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ أَسْأَلُهُ عَمَّا قَالَ هِشَامُ بْنُ الْحَكَمِ فِي الْجِسْمِ وَهِشَامُ بْنُ سَالِمٍ فِي الصُّورَةِ
فَكُتِبَ دَعَاكَ حَيْرَةُ الْهَيْرَانِ وَاسْتَعْذَرَ بِاللَّهِ مِنَ الشَّيْطَانِ لَيْسَ الْقَوْلُ مَا قَالَ الْهَشَامَانِ

I wrote to Abū al-Ḥasan asking him about the statement of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam about the body (of Allah) and that of Hishām ibn Sālim about the form (of Allah). He wrote, “Cast aside the confusion of those who are confused and seek the refuge of Allah. What both the Hishāms have stated is not the reality.”¹

The Imāms denounced them and their claims. And when a Shī‘ī came to the Imām and said:

إِنِّي أَقُولُ بِقَوْلِ هِشَامٍ

I affirm the verdict of Hishām.

The Imām said to him:

مَا لَكُمْ وَلِقَوْلِ هِشَامٍ؟ إِنَّهُ لَيْسَ مِنَّا مَنْ زَعَمَ أَنَّ اللَّهَ جِسْمٌ وَنَحْنُ مِنْهُ بَرَاءٌ فِي الدُّنْيَا وَالْآخِرَةِ

What do you have to do with the verdict of Hishām? The one who claims that Allah has a body is not from amongst us. We are free from him in this world and in the afterlife.²

And some of their narrations reveal what the Imāms said with regards to Allah ﷻ. One of the Shī‘ah³ tells Abū ‘Abd Allah al-Ṣādiq about the anthropomorphist beliefs of some of the Shī‘ah saying:

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/105; *al-Tawḥīd* p. 97; *Amālī al-Ṣādūq* p. 228; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 3/288; *al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī: Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah* p. 15.

2 *al-Tawḥīd* p. 104; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 3/291.

3 His name is Ya‘qūb ibn al-Sirāj. He is deemed reliable by the Shī‘ah (*al-Ṭūsī: al-Fihrist* p. 214).

إن بعض أصحابنا يزعم أن لله صورة مثل الإنسان، وقال آخر إنه في صورة أمرد جعد ققط! فخر أبو عبد الله عليه السلام ساجدا ثم رفع رأسه فقال: سبحان الذي ليس كمثله شيء، ولا تدركه الابصار ولا يحيط به علم

Some of our friends claim that Allah has a form like that of humans whilst others say that he has the features of a beardless boy with curly hair.

Abū ‘Abd Allāh fell into prostration. He, thereafter, raised his head and said, “Pure is the One who nothing resembles Him, whom the eyes cannot encompass, and knowledge cannot fully comprehend.”¹

Likewise Ibn Bābuwayh has narrated the following on the authority of Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad al-Kharrāz and Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn:

دخلنا علي أبي الحسن الرضا عليه السلام فحكينا له ما روي ان محمدا رأي ربه في هيئة الشاب الموفق في سن ابناء ثلاثين سنة، رجلاه في خضره و قلنا: إن هشام بن سالم و صاحب الطاق والميثمي يقولون: أنه أجوف إلي السرة و الباقي صمد، فخر ساجدا ثم قال سبحانك ما عرفوك ولا وحدوك فمن أجل ذلك و صفوك سبحانك لو عرفوك لو صفوك بما وصفت به نفسك.

We went to visit Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā. So we told him about the narration wherein it is reported that Muḥammad saw his lord in the form of a handsome man in His thirties wearing green. We said, “Hishām ibn Sālim, Ṣāhib al-Ṭāq², and al-Maytham³ say that he is hallow till the belly and the rest of his body is firm.” He fell into prostration and said, “You are pure; they have not recognised You, and nor have they believed in Your Oneness, hence they have described you [in this manner]. You are pure; if only they recognised You, if only they described You in the manner that you have described Yourself...”⁴

1 *al-Tawḥīd* p. 103-104; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 3/304.

2 Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Nu‘mān al-Aḥwal: Since he was known as *Shayṭān al-Ṭāq* (the devil of the corner), the Shī‘ah however call him *Mu‘min al-Ṭāq* (the believer of the corner).

3 ‘Alī ibn Ismā‘īl ibn Shu‘ayb ibn Maytham ibn Yaḥyā al-Tammār. He was from amongst the leading theologians of the Shī‘ah and authored a few books; one of them being *al-Imāmāh*. (*Rijāl al-Najāshī* p. 176)

4 *al-Tawḥīd* p. 113-114; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 4/40; *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/101.

As you can see, their major theologians overstated the attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى which led them to likening Him with the creation and that constitutes disbelief. This is because this goes against the verse:

لَيْسَ كَمِثْلِهِ شَيْءٌ

There is nothing like Allah.¹

They have denied the attributes of Allah which befit His majesty by describing Him in ways that He did not describe Himself. And their Imām would disapprove this way of theirs and would order them to stick to the manner in which Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has described Himself. There are multiple narrations in this regard.²

So by overstating the attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى they have superseded the correct affirmation of the attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى which was the creed of the Ahl al-Bayt; this led to two conflicting view points in the Shīʿī dogma; i.e. the anthropomorphist view of Hishām and company, and the non-anthropomorphist view of the Ahl al-Bayt as is mentioned in the narrations of the Shīʿah and is stated in the books of the scholars.³

1 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 11.

2 For more details see: *al-Tawhīd*, p 97-104: chapter regarding Allah not possessing a body or a form; *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*, 1/104-106: chapter regarding the prohibition of ascribing a body or form to Allah; *Biḥār al-Anwār*: there are forty eight narrations under the chapter regarding negating a body and a form; there are similar narrations in this regard documented under the biographies of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam, Hishām ibn Sālim, and Yūnus ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān in *Rijāl al-Kashshī*; also refer to the book *Majālis al-Muwahḥidīn fī Uṣūl al-Dīn*: p 23 of al-Ṭabaṭabāʾī.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*: 20/144.

Discussion Two

Their Denial of the Attributes of Allah

After they had exaggerated in affirming the attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, the Shīʿī dogma began to change in the latter portion of the third century. This was primarily due to the Shīʿah being highly influenced by the school of the *Muʿtazilah* (rationalists) whose salient feature was the denial of the attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى confirmed in the Qurʾān. This tendency rapidly increased in the fourth century with the works of al-Mufīd, al-Mūsawī (also known as al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā), and Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭūsī who relied greatly upon the works of the *Muʿtazilah*; to the extent that many of the aspects they cover in their books were copied verbatim from the books of the *Muʿtazilah*.¹ Likewise, the exegesis which they present for the verses of the *Ṣiḡāt* (attributes) of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and those pertaining to *Qadr* (pre-destiny) are all sourced from the exegeses of the *Muʿtazilah*.²

Hence, the one who studies the works of the later Shīʿī scholars will not sense any difference at all between them and the works of the *Muʿtazilah* with regards the names and attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, for rationalism (as they claim) is the criterion which induces all their opinions. The issues that the *Muʿtazilah* assert in this regard are the very same issues asserted by the later Shīʿī scholars, e.g. the issue of the Qurʾān being the created word of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, denying the belief that the believers will see Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى in the afterlife, and refuting the attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. In fact, the doubts that the *Muʿtazilah* once raised are the very doubts raised by the later Shīʿī scholars.

Yes, the only difference that the reader will pick up is that the Shīʿah have in this regard forged narrations (which emphatically deny the attributes of Allah) and projected them to the Imāms. Whereas as Ibn Taymiyyah states:

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, 1/229.

2 *Ibid*, 1/356.

أسسوا دينهم علي أن باب التوحيد والصفات لا يتبع فيه ما رأوه بقياس عقولهم

They have decided in principle that in aspects pertaining to the oneness of Allah and his attributes they will not subscribe to the conclusions of their intellect.¹

This (applying reason and intellect in matters of belief) is very clearly noticeable in their polemical works the likes of *al-Nukat Al-I'tiqādiyyah* of al-Mufid and *Nahj al-Mustarshidīn* of Ibn Muṭahhar among others.

This is in complete contrast with the *Shar'ī* (legal), academic, and rational proceedings of our dīn, for the attributes of Allah ﷻ are from the realm of the unseen and hence the knowledge thereof is purely based upon the Qur'ān and the Sunnah.

Despite the reliance of the Shī'ah upon logical arguments like the Mu'tazilah, you will notice that they present many narrations to support their stance with regards the denial of the attributes of Allah ﷻ, they fabricate reports and ascribe them to Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī رضي الله عنه and some of the scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt like Muḥammad al-Bāqir and Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, suggesting that they were also of the opinion of denial. Hence, we find that one of their contemporary scholars asserts that this is the fundamental proof for their denial of the attributes of Allah ﷻ. He says:

هل يبقي مجال للبحث عن الصفات وهل له طريق إلا الإذعان بكلمة أمير المؤمنين رضي الله عنه كمال الإخلاص نفي الصفات عنه

Is there any room for any discussion with regards to the attributes, and is there any other way besides having conviction in the verdict of 'Alī رضي الله عنه: "Complete devotion to him is by denying the attributes."²

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (with the research of Muḥammad Rashād Sālim), 2/78-79 or 1/232 of the Amīriyyah print.

2 Al-Zanjānī: 'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah al-Ithnay 'Ashariyyah p. 28.

You thus see that this nation has no fixed approach, this is obviously because any stance that is based on uncritical following is vulnerable to contradiction. So at times they rely upon logic and at times they rely upon reports. And, thus, they are swaying between a purely tradition based approach and a completely rationalistic one.

Having said this, it is established from ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt that they affirmed the attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى... The narrations in this regard are abundant and authentic in the books of the scholars.¹ Likewise, amidst the appallingly plentiful narrations of denial some narrations of theirs also concede this, a few of which will feature in the pages to come.

The examples of narrations ascribed to the Ahl al-Bayt which emphatically deny the attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى are overwhelming. E.g.

وكمال التوحيد نفي الصفات

The completeness of Tawḥīd lies within the denial of the attributes.²

Likewise:

وحمد الله نفي الصفات عنه

And the praise of Allah is in denying the attributes.³

ولا نفي (للتشبيه) مع إثبات الصفات

Rejecting anthropomorphism is not possible with affirming the attributes.⁴

Their scholar Ibn Muṭāḥhar al-Ḥillī has emphatically stated that their stance is like that of the Mu‘tazilah.⁵ Some of them have even said:

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/144.

2 *al-Tawḥīd* p. 57.

3 *Ibid* p. 34-35

4 *Ibid* p. 40.

5 Ibn Muṭāḥhar al-Ḥillī: *Nahj al-Mustarshidīn* p. 32.

And (our stance) is like that of the philosophers.¹

Just as a great many of their narrations describe Allah ﷻ with negative attributes, which they have made part of their denial of the established attributes of Allah ﷻ, Ibn Bābuwayh has documented more than seventy narrations which state that:

لا يوصف بزمان ولا مكان، ولا كيفية، ولا حركة، ولا انتقال، ولا بشيء من صفات الأجسام و ليس حسا
ولا جسمانيا ولا صورة

Allah cannot be described with time and space, movement and locomotion, nor with any of the attributes of bodies. He is not discernible, a possessor of body, or a form...²

Their scholars have all treaded this beguiling path of denying the attributes which feature in the Qur’ān and the Sunnah, and of describing Allah ﷻ with negative traits. Their scholar Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī, famously known as al-Qazwīnī, (d. 1300 A.H) who they awarded the title of the ‘thirteenth Imām’ due to him meeting the awaited Mahdī three times. He says in describing Allah ﷻ:

لا جزء له، وما لا جزء له لا تركيب فيه، وما ليس بمركب ليس بجوهر ولا عرض وما ليس بجوهر ليس بعقل ولا نفس ولا مادة ولا صورة ولا جسم وما ليس بجسم ليس في مكان ولا في زمان ولا في جهة ولا في وقت، وما ليس في جهة لا كم له ولا كيف ولا رتبة، وما لا كم له و كيف له ولا جهة ولا وضع له، وما ليس له وضع ولا في وقت ولا في مكان لا إضافة له ولا نسبة، وما لا نسبة له لا فعل فيه ولا انفعال، وما ليس بجسم ولا لون ولا في مكان ولا جهة لا يري ولا يدرك.

He has no composite parts; and that which does not comprise of composite parts does not possess a collective whole; and that which does not have a collective whole is not a substance or abstract; and that which is not a substance is not intelligent, self-subsistent, material and is not characterised by form or body; and that which does not have a body is space-less and timeless, it is not in a direction or in a specific time; and that which does not have a direction does not have quantity, quality, and a

1 *Majālis al-Muwaḥḥidīn fī Uṣūl al-Dīn* p. 21.

2 *al-Tawḥīd* p. 57.

status; and that which does not have quantity, quality, and a direction does not have a specific shape; and that which does not have a shape and does not exist in time or space has no apposition and external link; and that which has no external links has no actions and emotions; and that which is not a body nor a colour nor does it exist in a place or direction cannot be seen or grasped.¹

As you can see, he has sourced this pure denial from the works of the philosophers and heretics which entails the denial of the existence of Allah ﷻ.

سبحن ربك رب العزة عما يصفون و سلام علي المرسلين و الحمد لله رب العالمين

Pure is your Lord, the Lord of honour, from that which they describe. And peace be upon the Messengers, and all praises belong to Allah—the Lord of the Universe.²

This is nothing new, for this is the path of all those who digressed from the way of the Ambiyā' عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ, such as the disbelievers, the polytheists, the People of the Book, those who infiltrated their ranks from amongst the Sabians³, the

1 *Qalā'id al-Kharā'id fī Uṣūl al-'Aqā'id* p. 50; *Nahj al-Mustarshidīn* p. 45-47; *Majālis al-Muwahhīdīn Fī Uṣūl al-Dīn* p. 21.

2 *Sūrah al-Ṣaffāt*: 180-182.

3 Many of the Sabians have adopted the stance of describing Allah ﷻ with negative traits. Bayrūnī thus mentions regarding the Sabians of Ḥarrān: they describe Allah ﷻ with negative qualities rather than positive ones, e.g. he cannot be confined, cannot be seen, does not oppress and does not wrong. They apply the beautiful names of Allah ﷻ to him metaphorically, for they do not believe in the literal attributes. Just as they ascribe the running of the world to the skies and its orbiting bodies. (*Al-Āthār al-Bāqiyah 'An al-Qur'ūn al-Hāliyah* p. 205). There is difference of opinion with regards to the ethnicity of the Sabians; Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī has documented a narration wherein Mujāhid and others mention, “The Sabians are a people who are not purely fire-worshippers nor Jews or Christians; they do not really have a faith (*Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 2/146). This is the preferred opinion of Ibn Kathīr as well (*Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 1/107). Al-Rāzī's preferred opinion is that they were a sect that worshiped stars in the era of Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام (*I'tiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn wa al-Mushrikīn* p. 142). Shahrastānī states that there were two groups: the Sabians and the *Ḥunafā'*, (the monotheists) (*al-Milāl wa al-Niḥal*: 1: 230). They were known as the *Ṣābi'ah* (denouncers of faith) due to digressing from the teachings of the Ambiyā', for *Ṣāba'a* literally translates as going astray (*Ibid* 2/5). Also refer to *al-Asfarā'ini's al-Tabṣīr fī al-Dīn* p. 89; Ibn Taymiyyah's *al-Radd 'alā al-Manṭiqiyyīn* p. 287-289, 454-457; *al-Muqrīzī's al-Khuṭaṭ* 2/344.

philosophers, the *Jahmiyyah*¹, and the *Bāṭiniyyah*², etc. For they describe Allah ﷻ with negative attributes with completeness of detail whereas, on the other hand, they only affirm the existence of Allah ﷻ generally which amounts to nothing in essence; for this leads to ultimately denying the very existence of Allah ﷻ. This is because their denial of the names and attributes of Allah ﷻ ultimately leads to the denial of his existence. Just as it necessitates *Tamthīl* (assimilating Allah with the creation) in the sense that they assimilate Allah ﷻ with improbabilities, non-existent entities, and inanimate things.³

They all try to avoid one thing but eventually get gripped in something just like it or even worst. That is besides the fact that they become victims of interpolation and denial.⁴

Whereas Allah ﷻ has sent the Ambiyā' عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ with the elaborate affirmation of his attributes and the general denial of traits that do not befit his majesty.⁵ This is exactly what we see in the Qur'ān as well (i.e. the detailed affirmation of the attributes of Allah ﷻ and a general negation of all unsuitable traits).⁶ Allah ﷻ says:

1 The followers of al-Jahm ibn Ṣafwān. From amongst his deviances is the denial of the attributes and other innovative beliefs such as *Irjā'* (sinning with īmān is not harmful) and *Jabr* (the belief that all servants are divinely coerced) and that Jannah and Jahannam will one day perish. See: Imām Aḥmad: *al-Radd 'alā al-Jahmiyyah* p. 64; al-Bukhārī: *Khalq Af'āl al-'Ibād* p. 118; al-Ash'arī: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/214; al-Malaṭī: *al-Tanbīh wa al-Radd* p. 218; al-Asfarā'īnī: *al-Tabṣīr fī al-Dīn* p. 63; al-Maqdisī: *al-Bad' wa al-Tārīkh* 5/146 and *Tārīkh al-Jahmiyyah wa al-Mu'tazilah* etc.

The term '*Jahmiyyah*' was not only applied to the followers of Jahm ibn Ṣafwān. Ibn Taymiyyah says, "The pious predecessors would dub any person who denied the attributes of Allah ﷻ, said that the Qur'ān is the creation of Allah, or believed that Allah will not be seen in the afterlife, as a *Jahmī*." (*Majma' al-Fatāwā* 12/119) He says in another place, "And from among the *Jahmiyyah* are the philosophers and the *Mu'tazilah* who claim that the word of Allah is created." (Ibid 12/523)

2 One of the titles of the *Ismā'īlī Shī'ahs*.

3 Ibn Taymiyyah: *al-Tadmuriyyah* p. 16.

4 Ibid p. 19.

5 Ibid p. 8.

6 *Sharḥ al-Taḥāwīyyah* p. 49.

لَيْسَ كَمِثْلِهِ شَيْءٌ وَهُوَ السَّمِيعُ الْبَصِيرُ

There is nothing like Him and He is the All Hearing, All Seeing.¹

Hence, the negation is general. This is the methodology of the Qur’ān in most cases. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

هَلْ تَعْلَمُ لَهُ سَمِيًّا

Do you know a namesake for Allah?²

In other words, an equal who deserves the same name as him. It is also said: Any competitor who can compete with him.³

This is the meaning of what is narrated from Ibn ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا, “Do you know any equal to him or anyone similar to him.”⁴

Likewise Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

وَلَمْ يَكُنْ لَهُ كُفُوًا أَحَدٌ

And there is no one equal to Him.⁵

As for the affirmation of the attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, it is explained in complete detail like:

وَهُوَ السَّمِيعُ الْبَصِيرُ

And He is the All Hearing All Seeing.

1 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 11.

2 Sūrah Maryam: 65.

3 *Al-Tadmuriyyah* p. 8; *Lisān al-‘Arab* (under the root letters سمي)

4 *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 16/106.

5 Sūrah al-Ikhlāṣ: 4.

And like the concluding verses of Sūrah al-Ḥashr:

هُوَ اللَّهُ الَّذِي لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا هُوَ عَالِمُ الْغَيْبِ وَالشَّهَادَةِ هُوَ الرَّحْمَنُ الرَّحِيمُ هُوَ اللَّهُ الَّذِي لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا هُوَ الْمَلِكُ الْقُدُّوسُ السَّلَامُ الْمُؤْمِنُ الْمُهَيْمِنُ الْعَزِيزُ الْجَبَّارُ الْمُتَكَبِّرُ سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ عَمَّا يُشْرِكُونَ هُوَ اللَّهُ الْخَالِقُ الْبَارِئُ الْمُصَوِّرُ لَهُ الْأَسْمَاءُ الْحُسْنَى يُسَبِّحُ لَهُ مَا فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَهُوَ الْعَزِيزُ الْحَكِيمُ.

He is Allah besides Who there is no deity. He is the Sovereign, the Most Pure, the Giver of Peace, the Giver of Security, the Vigilant, the Mighty, the Dominant, and the Glorious. Pure is Allah from what they ascribe to Him. He is the Creator, the Perfect Maker, the Fashioner. For Him are beautiful names. All that is in the heavens and the earth glorify Him. And He is the Mighty, the Wise.¹

There are many examples of this nature.²

Therefore, the method of these people is not in harmony with the Qur’ān, just as it is inharmonious with sound human disposition and evident rationality. Instead it is frowned upon by humans in praise of humans. So how can Allah, the Lord of the multi-verse, be praised in this manner?³

Although the Shī‘ah narrate from the Imāms that “the creator should not be described but with attributes with which he has described himself”, they have disregarded this just as they have disregarded the Book of Allah ﷻ, the demands of rationality, and the dictates of sound disposition. All of this is

1 Al-Ḥashr: 24.

2 Shaikh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyah رحمه الله has discussed most of them in his book *al-Risālah al-Tadmuriyyah* p. 8.

3 The commentator of al-Taḥāwīyyah states: “Pure negation does not entail any praise. Not forgetting that with it is disrespectful. If you were to say to the king, “You are not a street sweeper, a cupper or a weaver.” He would admonish you even though you are articulating the truth. However, if you negating all negative traits in very broad terms saying, “You are not like any of your subjects” is indeed extolling his virtues and showing respect to him. (‘Alī ibn Abī al-‘Iz: *Sharḥ al-Taḥāwīyyah* p. 50.

affected by uncritical following and the remnants of perishing philosophies. Or else why would an intelligent person rely upon an inadequate brain, a faltering thought-process, self-contradictory human assumptions, and their conflicting conjecture in matters of the unseen; which can only be affirmed and realised by way of divine revelation.

The scholars of Islam have very vehemently refuted the claims of these Mu'aṭṭilah (deniers of the attributes of Allah), thus, I will not repeat the same and return to their refutations... However it would be fruitful to sketch this contentious issue from the books of the Shī'ah, from the narrations of their Imāms, and the statements of their scholars, since these are primarily in support of the deniers. In this way the extent of their contradiction, aloofness from their Imāms, and the extent to which the Saba'ī hands were influential in corrupting the creed of the Imāms, forging narrations of denial, and uncritically approbative of its outcomes, will become abundantly clear.

For this, I will choose three issues:

1. The created/uncreated nature of the Qur'ān.
2. Seeing Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى in the afterlife.
3. Divine descent.

Thereafter, I will endeavour to illustrate by way of textual proof extracted from Shī'ī sources that the stance of the Imāms were moderate; neither was it exaggeratedly anthropomorphic, nor was it rigidly denying. This exactly is the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah and it is in accordance with reliable texts and profound reason.

1. Their stance with regards to the Qur'ān being created

The Qur'ān is the revealed uncreated Word of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. This is what is asserted in the Qur'ān, the Sunnah, and the consensus of the early scholars of

the Ummah.¹ The Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah on the other hand have treaded the path of the Jahmiyyah in positing that the Qur’ān is the created word of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. Al-Majlisī, the grand Shī‘ī scholar of his time, has established a chapter in his *Biḥār* regarding the Qur’ān, which he titled, Chapter regarding the Qur’ān being created.² Therein, he has documented eleven narrations. However, most of these narrations prove the opposite of his viewpoint, but the Shī‘ah have a method of manipulating them which we will mention after a while.

The Shī‘ī scholar Muḥsin al-Amīn states:

قالت الشيعة والمعتزلة القرآن مخلوق.

The Shī‘ah and the Mu‘tazilah say that the Qur’ān is created.³

This is due to them denying the attribute of speech for Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and due to them claiming that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى:

يوجد الكلام في بعض مخلوقاته كالشجرة حين كلم موسى وكجبرئيل حين أنزله بالقرآن.

Creates speech in some of his creation, like the tree when it conversed with Mūsā, and Jibrīl when Allah sent him with the Qur’ān.⁴

This is some of what their scholars have said in this regard.⁵

1 See: Imam Aḥmad: *al-Radd ‘alā al-Zanādiqah wa al-Jahmiyyah*; Imam Bukhārī: *Khalq Af‘āl al-‘Ibād*; al-Dārīmī, *al-Radd ‘alā al-Jahmiyyah*, *Radd ‘Uthmān ibn Sa‘īd ‘alā al-Murrīsī*; Ibn Qutaybah: *al-Radd ‘alā al-Jahmiyyah wa al-Mushabbihah* and *al-Ikhtilāf fī al-Lafz*; al-Najjād: *al-Radd ‘alā man Yaqūlu al-Qur’ān makhluq*; Ibn Mandah: *Al-Radd ‘alā al-Jahmiyyah*.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 92/117-121.

3 *A’yān al-Shī‘ah* 1/461.

4 *Ibid* 1/453.

5 Ibn Taymiyyah when asked regarding a person who holds this view, ruled that he is an infidel and that he should be asked to repent. He also said that he will be hailed an infidel even though he says, I do not disbelieve in the verse, “Allah specially spoke to Mūsā,” (al-Nisā’: 164) rather I affirm that these words are true but I deny its literal meaning. He says, “These are the Jahmiyyah regarding whom the early scholars and leaders are unanimous that they are the worst of the deviant sects, to the extent that some of them have even excluded them from the seventy two sects of Islam.” (See: Ibn Taymiyyah, *Majmū‘ah al-Rasā’il wa al-Masā’il* 1/474; *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 12/502). He says in another place, “The early scholars of the Ummah have dubbed the Jahmiyyah who say that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى created speech in some bodies which Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام heard as infidels.” (*Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 12/533).

If you source the narrations which they transmit on the authority of the Ahl al-Bayt you will find that most of them oppose this stance which the Shī'ah have taken. One of them is the narration which appears in *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī*:

عن الرضا أنه سئل عن القرآن فقال... إنه كلام الله غير مخلوق.

Al-Riḍā was asked regarding the Qur'ān he said, "... It is the uncreated Word of Allah."¹

And in *Rijāl al-Kashshī* it is mentioned:

إن الكلام ليس بمخلوق

The speech is uncreated.²

And in Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī's book *al-Tawhīd* the following is mentioned:

قيل لأبي الحسن موسى رضي الله عنه: يا ابن رسول الله ما تقول في القرآن: فقد اختلف فيه من قبلنا فقال قوم: إنه مخلوق، وقال قوم: إنه غير مخلوق، فقال رضي الله عنه: أما إنني لا أقول في ذلك ما يقولون، ولكني أقول: إنه كلام الله عز وجل.

Abū al-Hasan Mūsā was asked, "O the son of Rasūl Allah! What is your opinion regarding the Qur'ān? Because the people in our region have disputed the matter; some say that it is created while others say that it is uncreated."

He replied, "Behold! I do not say what they say. Instead I say that it is the Speech of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى"³

There are many narrations in this regard.⁴ However, the Shaykh of the Shī'ah in his time Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī whilst interpreting these reports has leaned

1 *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī* 1/8.

2 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 490.

3 *al-Tawhīd* p. 224.

4 *Al-Bihār* 92/117-121; *al-Tawhīd* p. 223-229.

toward a totally different view; he proves that the words “uncreated (*Ghayr Makhlūq*)” means:

أنه غير مخلوق أي غير مكذوب لا يعني به أنه غير محدث

It is *Ghayr Makhlūq*, i.e. it is not a lie. It does not mean that it is not created.¹

He further says, “The reason why we refrained from applying the meaning of ‘creation’ is because the word *Makhlūq* literally at times means a lie; it is said: *Kalām Makhlūq*, i.e. a lie.”²

There is no doubt that this interpretation is not sound, because it is obvious that the previously cited narrations oppose the stance taken by the *Mu‘tazilah* with regards to the creation of the *Qur’ān*. Hence, the pious predecessors refuted their claims asserting that it is the uncreated Word of Allah ﷻ. They did not intend that it is not a lie as Ibn Bābuwayh and others claim, for no one amongst the Muslims ever claimed that it was a lie, instead this is blatant disbelief which every Muslim is aware of. In essence, what they (the *Mu‘tazilah*) said was that Allah created his speech in something. This is what the pious predecessors rejected it, as is documented in multiple narrations and in many books.³

In *Tafsīr al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm* of Ayatollah al-Burūjardī he quotes a text of Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī wherein he interprets the aforementioned texts with the taint of *Taqiyyah*. Thus, he says:

و لعل المنع من إطلاقه الخلق علي القران إما للتقية مماشة مع العامة أو لكونه موهما لمعني اخر أطلق الكفار عليه بهذا المعني في قولهم إن هذا إلا اختلاق

It is very likely that abstaining from attributing creation upon the *Qur’ān* was either due to *Taqiyyah* in order to outwardly agree with the commonality (i.e.

1 *al-Tawhīd* p. 225; *Al-Bihār* 92/119.

2 *Ibid*.

3 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 12/301.

the Ahl al-Sunnah) or due to it insinuating an undesirable meaning which the infidels would intend in their saying, “This is not but a fabrication.”¹

It is clear that these scholars found nothing to support their stance besides the idea of Taqiyyah and its like. This proves that they have no solid anchorage and that the mere possibility of Taqiyyah being present in every text has ruined their faith and has stripped it of any essence. Their faith has thus become the faith of al-Majlisī, al-Kulaynī or Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī rather than it being a faith based upon the traditions of the Imāms.²

It thus became plausible for every shaykh, heretic, or fraudster—who masquerades as a shaykh and flaunts his knowledge—to choose a view from among these conflicting views which appeals to his heterodoxy, ignorance, or ego; and discard the other views even though they may be true. In supporting his stance he substantiates it by way of Taqiyyah or by the claim that it opposes the view of the Ahl al-Sunnah—for in opposing them lies guidance. In this deceitful way does he destroy knowledge, the truth, and the faith, and predetermines disunity and discord for the Ummah by way of these methodologies which stem from the inspiration of the devil and his cunningness.

If any Shīʿī scholar desired good for the Shīʿah he would have treaded the path of the majority and would have accepted from Shīʿī narrations only those which are harmonious with the Qurʾān and those which are accepted by the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamāʿah. He would have freed himself from the ploys of al-Qummī, al-Kulaynī, and al-Majlisī; especially when the Imāms have time and again complained of the fraudsters who forged things and attributed lies to them. They said:

1 *Tafsīr al-Şirāṭ al-Mustaqīm* 1/304.

2 See: *al-Durrah al-Najafiyyah* of Hāshim al-Baḥrānī p. 60 onwards, for he has endeavoured to explain the variant narrations which exist due to Taqiyyah and he has revealed their confusion with regards to which view is to be taken; should the first one be adopted or the last, should the matter be left pending, should any of the two be chosen or what should he do with these conflicting reports and views. Hence, Taqiyyah has, as al-Baḥrānī states, the basis of any ruling is not void of doubt and confusion due to the excessive divergence of opinion and the contradictory supporting elements. (*Al-Durrah al-Najafiyyah* p. 61). Also see the chapter of Taqiyyah in this book.

People are obsessed with lying against us.¹

If you really intend to apply this methodology, i.e. accepting those narrations of the Ahl al-Bayt which are in harmony with the traditions of the Ahl al-Sunnah; you will find that the books of the Shī'ah record many narrations from the Ahl al-Bayt which clearly state that the word of Allah ﷻ is revealed and uncreated; just as you will find that the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah are replete with narrations containing the same. Imām al-Bukhārī رحمه الله in his book *Khalq Af'āl al-'Ibād*², Ibn Abī Ḥātim³, Abū Sa'īd al-Dārīmī⁴, al-Ājurrī in *al-Sharī'ah*⁵, al-Bayhaqī in *Al-I'tiqād*⁶ and *al-Asmā' wa al-Ṣifāt*⁷, al-Lālikā'ī in *Sharḥ Uṣūl I'tiqād Ahl al-Sunnah*⁸, and Abū Dāwūd in *Masā'il al-Imām Aḥmad*⁹ have all documented a narration on the authority from Ja'far al-Ṣādiq that he was asked with regards to the Qur'ān whereupon he replied:

ليس بخالق ولا مخلوق

Neither is it the Creator nor is it created.

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 135-136. For more details refer to the chapter regarding their belief with regard to the Sunnah of this book.

2 *Khalq Af'āl al-'Ibād* (revised by Badr) p. 36 & p. 135 (revised by al-Nashshār and 'Ammār al-Ṭālibī).

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (revised by Muḥammad Rashād Sālim) 2/187-188.

4 *Al-Radd 'alā al-Jahmiyyah* p. 101.

5 *Al-Sharī'ah* p. 77.

6 *Al-I'tiqād* p. 36. Al-Bayhaqī thereafter states, "This is a famous authentic report from Ja'far رحمه الله, it has been narrated from Ja'far ibn Muḥammad from his father, from 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn. And al-Zuhrī has narrated it from 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn. We have narrated it in variant ways from Mālik ibn Anas and this is the stance of all the former and latter scholars. (Ibid p. 39)

7 *Al-Asmā' wa al-Ṣifāt* p. 247.

8 *Sharḥ Uṣūl I'tiqād ahl al-Sunnah* 2/238, 241-242.

9 *Masā'il al-Imām Aḥmad* (Beirut) p. 265 or p. 106-107 (in the compilation of the beliefs of the pious predecessors).

Ibn Taymiyyah says that this has been very popularly narrated from Ja'far al-Şādiq.¹

So why is the unanimously agreed upon meaning not taken and why is the falsehood not discarded, for it is not supported but by the verdicts of scholars who desire to plant the seeds of disquiet and dispute in the Ummah, who seek peculiarity and aloofness in order to conveniently amass big sums of money in the name of *Khums* (one fifth of the wealth of people) and so that they may preside over the lofty position of representing the hidden Mahdī; therefore, we find them always emphasising that in any thing that opposes the Ahl al-Sunnah there is guidance.

Whereas if the word *al-‘Āmmah* (commonality) is taken in its literal sense the Mu‘tazilah whom they have emulated also fall part of it, for the stance of the Qur’ān being created was the stance of the Mu‘tazilah. ‘Abd al-Jabbār says in his *Sharḥ al-Uṣūl al-Khamsah*:

و أما مذهبنا في ذلك (اي في القرآن) فهو أن القرآن كلام الله تعالى ووحيه و هو مخلوق محدث

As to our stance with regards to this matter, the Qur’ān is the speech of Allah and His revelation and it is created and brought into existence.²

This is one of the many ideas of the Mu‘tazilah which the Shī‘ah have assimilated into their dogma... which suggests that they didn’t really succeed in opposing the ‘commonality’.

The first person to invent this idea was al-Ja’d ibn Dirham.³ ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Ibn Abī Ḥātim states:

1 *Minḥāj al-Sunnah* 2/163.

2 *Sharḥ al-Uṣūl al-Khamsah* p. 528; *al-Muḥīṭ bi al-Taklīf* p. 331.

3 Ibn Ḥajar says, “Al-Ja’d is considered from the era of the Tābi‘īn; he was a deviant innovator who claimed that Allah ﷻ had not befriended Ibrāhīm ﷺ and had not conversed with Mūsā ﷺ. He was executed in Iraq on the day of *Nahr* (tenth of Dhū al-Ḥijjah). There are many narrations discussing his deviations. (*Lisān al-Mīzān* 2/105; *Mīzān al-I’tidāl* 1/399; Ibn Nabātah, *Sarḥ al-‘Uyūn* p. 293-294.

أول من أتى بخلق القرآن جعد بن درهم فهو أول من قال بمبدأ التعطيل في هذه الأمة ثم تلقى ذلك عنه
الجهيم بن صفوان

The first person to coin the idea of the creation of the Qur'ān was al-Ja'd ibn Dirham.¹ Similarly he is the first person to deny the attributes of Allah ﷻ; thereafter, al-Jahm ibn Ṣafwān learnt them from him.

Some suggest that this idea returns in its origins to foreign influences, for Ibn al-Athīr, Ibn Taymiyyah, and others have mentioned that al-Ja'd had taken this idea from Abān ibn Sam'ān, and he from Ṭālūt—the son of the sister of Labīd ibn al-A'sam (the Jew who had poisoned Nabī ﷺ, who was of the opinion that the *Tawrah* (old testament) is created. Ṭālūt was irreligious and was the first to write a book in this regard. Then, al-Ja'd promulgated it.² Just as al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī mentions that the father of Bishr al-Murrīsī, one of the proponents of the idea of creation from among the Mu'tazilah, was a Jew.³

From here the Jewish influence on this idea becomes evident.

Ibn Taymiyyah makes further mention of foreign influences upon the idea. He mentions that al-Ja'd ibn Dirham was from Ḥarrān, therein there were some Sabians and philosophers who rejected the message of Ibrāhīm ﷺ. He thus denied that Allah ﷻ conversed with Mūsā ﷺ and that he befriended Ibrāhīm ﷺ concurring in this regard with Fir'awn and Namrūd based on their principle of denial in that neither speech can co-exist with Allah, nor can love for someone else. Hence, the Muslims had him executed subsequent to which many devious people followed his path.⁴

1 *Sharḥ Uṣūl I'tiqād ahl al-Sunnah* p. 382. After this text the following is mentioned, "He promulgated this idea somewhere after 120 A.H." However the author has not critiqued this narration despite the fact that al-Ja'd was executed around the year 118 A.H.

2 Ibn al-Athīr: *al-Kāmil* 5/294; Ibn Taymiyyah: *al-Ḥamawīyyah* (included in *Fatāwā*) 5/20, 21; Ibn Nabātah: *Sharḥ al-'Uyūn* p. 293; al-Saffārīnī: *Lawāmi' al-Anwār* 1/23.

3 *Tārīkh Baghdād*, 7/61.

4 *Dar' Ta'āruḍ al-'Aql wa al-Naql* 7/175-176.

Those narrations which feature in the books of the Shī'ah which assert that the Qur'ān is revealed and uncreated represent the position of the early scholars among the Shī'ah as is indicated by the scholars;¹ for the position that the Qur'ān is a creation is from the innovations of the later Shī'ī scholarship.²

Likewise the position that the Qur'ān is revealed and uncreated is proven to be the position of the Ahl al-Bayt. For there is not a single Imām from the Ahl al-Bayt, the likes of 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, Abū Ja'far al-Bāqir, and his son Ja'far, who was of the opinion that the Qur'ān is created. However, the Shī'ah oppose majority of the principles of the Ahl al-Bayt.³

As for their statement that Allah ﷻ created his speech in a tree when conversing to Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, it is in complete contrast with the explicit verse:

وَكَلَّمَ اللَّهُ مُوسَى تَكْلِيمًا

And Allah spoke to Mūsā specially.⁴

The emphasis with the verbal noun 'taklīm' denies any possibility of a metaphorical explanation of the verse. Hence, many scholars have said that emphasis created by way of a verbal noun disallows the concession of metaphor.⁵

If their interpretation was to be considered correct, then there remains no exclusive virtue for Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, mention of which Allah ﷻ makes in the Qur'ān:

من سمع كلام الله من ملك او من نبي آتاه به من عند الله افضل مرتبة في سماء الكلام من موسى، لانهم سمعوه من نبي، و موسى سمعه من شجرة... ويلزمهم أن تكون الشجرة هي التي قالت: إني أنا الله لا أله إلا أنا فاعبدني. وهذا ظاهر الفساد.

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/296.

2 *Al-Ash'arī: Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/114.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/296.

4 *Sūrah al-Nisā'*: 164.

5 *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 12/515.

A person who hears the Speech of Allah from an angel or from a Nabī who conveys it on his behalf is more privileged than Mūsā عليه السلام, because they are hearing it from a Nabī whereas Mūsā عليه السلام heard it from a tree... this also obviously posits that the tree addressed Mūsā عليه السلام saying, “Indeed I am Allah, there is no deity besides me, so worship me.” And this is evidently wrong.¹

The refutation of the Jahmiyyah who are deniers of the attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is abundantly found in the works of the *Tābi’īn* (the successors of the Ṣaḥābah), their successors, and the great luminaries. There are extensive narrations discussing the nature of the Qur’ān² which are documented in dedicated works. However, it would be interesting to add here in critiquing the Shī’ī doctrine after the emergence of their literature to the fore and its proliferation that they, despite not according this virtue to Mūsā عليه السلام by denying that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى spoke to him and claiming that the tree in fact spoke to him, did not deny this in respect of their Imām and they completely overlooked this issue when extolling the virtues of the A’immah.

There appears a chapter in one of their canonical works *Biḥār al-Anwār* by the name Chapter: Regarding Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى conversing with the Imām³ in this chapter the author presents a few narrations discussing the topic and thereafter he attributes them—as is his habit—to a group of their reliable books. One of these narrations state:

لما بعث رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ببراءة مع أبي بكر و انزل الله عليه: تترك من ناجيته غير مرة، و تبعث من لم أناجه؟ فأرسل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله فأخذ براءة منه و دفعها الي علي رضي الله عنه فقال له علي: أوصني يا رسول الله، فقال له، إن الله يوصيك و يناجيك، قال: فناجاه يوم براءة قبل صلاة الأولي إلي صلاة العصر

When the Rasūl of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ sent Abū Bakr with Sūrah Barā’ah, Allah revealed to him, “You are leaving the person whom I addressed a few times

1 *Al-I’tiqād ‘alā madhhab al-Salaf* p. 33.

2 *Majmū’ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 12/418.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 39/151.

and are sending someone who I did not converse with at all?”¹

The Rasūl of Allah ﷺ thus sent for him, took Sūrah Barā’ah away from him and gave it to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.

‘Alī thus said, “O Rasūl of Allah, advise me.”

He said, “Allah will advise you and address you.”

He says that Allah conversed with him on the Day of Barā’ah from before the Ṣalāt al-Fajr up until Ṣalāt al-‘Aṣr.²

Another narration states the following:

إن الله ناجاه (يعني عليا) يوم الطائف و يوم عقبة تبوك، و يوم حنين

Allah ﷻ conversed with ‘Alī on the Day of Ṭā’if, the Day of Tabūk, and the Day of Ḥunayn.³

And in *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt*, *al-Ikhtiṣās*, and *Biḥār al-Anwār* there is a narration which says:

عن أبي عبد الله قال: قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لأهل الطائف: لأبعثن إليكم رجلا كنفي يفتح الله به الخبير، سوطه سيفه (ثم تذكر الرواية اختبار علي لهذه المهمة، وأن الرسول لحق به ولما وصلها) (كان علي علي رأس الجبل فقال له رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: اثبت فثبت، فسمعنا مثل صرير الزجل فقبل يا رسول الله ما هذا؟ قال: إن الله يناجي عليا رضي الله عنه

Abū ‘Abd Allah al-Ṣādiq says that the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ said to the people of Ṭā’if, “I will send to you a man like me upon whose hands Allah will give victory in Khaybar; his whip will be his sword...”

1 Take note that at this juncture they allegedly claim that Allah ﷻ reprimanded Rasūl Allah ﷺ and exposed his mistake...This blatantly opposes the claim of complete infallibility with which they describe Rasūl Allah ﷺ and the Imāms...contradiction is very rampant in all their texts.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 39/155.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 39/154. *Al-Ikhtiṣās* p. 328.

(The narration then mentions that ‘Alī عليه السلام was chosen for this task and that the Rasūl of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم tagged along behind him. When he reached him,)

‘Alī was at the head of the mountain.

So the Rasūl of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم said to him, “Remain firm, remain firm.”

Thus we heard something like thundering.¹ It was said, “O Rasūl of Allah! What is that?”

He said, “Allah is conversing with ‘Alī عليه السلام.”²

Aside from the historical flaws in the narration and confounding the battles of Khaybar and Tabūk, the reader will most probably note the resemblance given to the speech of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى; for the element of anthropomorphism is clear in the words “like thundering”. And the narration does not indicate that ‘Alī عليه السلام heard this from a tree or anything of that sort. So what is wrong with them? At times they lean toward utter denial whilst at other occasions they lean toward anthropomorphism. Do these narrations perhaps suggest the phases through which Shī‘ism traversed from first being anthropomorphist and then switching to utter denial in the third century when the winds of I‘tizāl were violently blowing? Or is it that the fabricators of these narrations represent every creed with the result that each one of them fabricates that which his creed dictates to him?

In essence, love for ‘Alī عليه السلام is a virtue so meritorious that coupled with it no sin is harmful, as they allege.

And they do not find any reason to justify their standing besides Taqiyyah. And not one of their scholars is able to identify the view which is based on Taqiyyah from the other except by asserting that it is the one that opposes the commonality (i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah), for in it lies guidance. If only they said, “That which is harmonious with the Qur’ān is the truth and that which opposes it is Taqiyyah.”

1 The translation is taken from the explanation given in: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 39/156; *al-Ikhtiṣās* p. 200.

2 *Al-Ikhtiṣās* p. 200-201; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 39/155-156; *Al-Ṣaffār: Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* (refer to previous reference).

Lastly, is it not sufficient in exposing the falsity of their dogma that it is a foreign element to the ummah, that it is against the creed of the Ahl al-Bayt, that it is against many of their narrations which are in harmony with the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and that their narrations are all riddled with contradiction?

2. Seeing Allah in the afterlife

For the people of Jannah to see Allah ﷻ, without encompassing His Being and without any specific manner, is true as is mentioned in the Qur'ān:

وَجُوهٌ يَوْمَئِذٍ نَّاطِرَةٌ إِلَىٰ رَبِّهَا نَاطِرَةٌ

On that day some faces will be radiant, gazing at their lord.¹

As for the traditions of Nabī ﷺ and his Ṣaḥābah which establish seeing Allah ﷻ, they are mass transmitted and have been documented by the authors of the Ṣiḥāḥ, the Masānīd, and the Sunan.²

The Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, their successors, and the renowned acclaimed scholars of the Ummah who were known for their supremacy in dīn were all proponents of seeing Allah ﷻ. Likewise was the opinion of all the theologians who subscribed to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah.³

The Jahmiyyah, Mu'tazilah, *Khawārij* (those who rebelled against 'Alī), and the Twelver Shī'ah⁴ were opponents of seeing Allah ﷻ. Their stance, however, is baseless and rejected by the Qur'ān, the Sunnah, and the consensus of the pious predecessors.⁵

1 Sūrah al-Qiyāmah: 22, 23. The text is cited from Imam al-Ṭaḥāwī (see: *Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwīyyah* p. 146.

2 'Alī ibn al-'Iz: *Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwīyyah* p. 151.

3 *Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwīyyah* p. 146.

4 Ibid.

5 Imām Ahmad: *al-Radd 'alā al-Zanādiqah* p. 85; *Radd al-Imām al-Dārimī 'Uthmān ibn Sa'īd 'alā al-Murrīsī al-'Anīd* p. 413; al-Lālikātī: *Sharḥ Uṣūl I'tiqād ahl al-Sunnah* 3/454; al-Ājurri: *al-Taṣdīq bi al-Naẓr ilā Allah*; Abū Shāmmah: *Ḍaw' al-Sārī ilā Ma'rifaḥ Ru'yah al-Bārī*; al-Shīrāzī: *al-Tabṣīrah* p. 229; *Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwīyyah* p. 146; *Mukhtaṣar al-Ṣawā'iq al-Mursalāh* p. 179.

Hereunder I shall quote the opinion of the Shī'ah from their sources in this regard:

The Shī'ah have, due to conforming to the Mu'tazilah, inclined toward the denial of seeing Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. There are many a narrations which Ibn Bābuwayh has cited in his *al-Tawhīd*, majority of which were later quoted by al-Majlisī in his *Biḥār al-Anwār*. These narrations reject that which appears in clear-cut verses and traditions with regards to the believers seeing Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى in the afterlife. These narrations, for example, falsely allege that Abū 'Abd Allah Ja'far al-Ṣādiq was asked:

عن الله تبارك و تعالي هل يري في المعاد؟ فقال سبحان الله و تعالي عن ذلك علوا كبيرا.. إن الأبصار لا تدرك إلا ما له لون و كيفية، والله خالق الألوان و الكيفية

“Will Allah Ta'ālā be seen in the afterlife?”

He said, “Pure is Allah and Exalted is He from that... The eyes can only grasp that which has colour and modality whereas Allah is the creator of colour and modality.”¹

This narration contradicts what the author of *al-Kāfi* has reported from Abū 'Abd Allah. He said:

ولكن لا بد من إثبات أن له كيفية لا يستحقها غيره ولا يشارك فيها ولا يحاط بها ولا يعلمها غيره

However, it is necessary to affirm his modality which no one else besides him is worthy of, no one besides him can share, which cannot be fully grasped, and no one can have knowledge of.”²

Ja'far al-Najafī, the student of Kāshif al-Ghiṭā' states:

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 4/31. He has referenced this from the *Amālī* of al-Ṣādūq.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/85.

If a person ascribes some attributes to Allah such as the possibility of Him being seen, he will be considered a renegade.¹

Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī has enumerated the denial of seeing Allah from the fundamental beliefs of the Imāms. He has established a chapter to prove this which is, Chapter: that no eye will see Allah in this world and the hereafter.²

So their denial of seeing their Lord in the afterlife is digressing from the dictates of the divine texts just as it is defecting from the creed of the Ahl al-Bayt. Some of their narrations confirm this. Hence, Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī narrates from Abū Baṣīr that he asked Abū ʿAbd Allah:

أخبرني عن الله عز وجل هل يراه المؤمنون يوم القيامة؟ قال: نعم

“Tell me about Allah ﷻ. Will the believers see him on the day of judgement?”

He said, “Yes.”³

3. The descent of Allah

Furthermore, the descent of Allah ﷻ is something that is very extensively narrated in the Sunnah of the Rasūl ﷺ, the pious predecessors of the Ummah, and the scholars of Sunnah and Ḥadīth have all unanimously accepted it⁴ and established it (as it befits his majesty and is unique to his grandeur).

1 *Kashf al-Ghiṭāʾ* p. 417.

2 *Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah fī Uṣūl al-ʿImmah* p. 12.

3 *al-Tawḥīd* p. 117; *Bihār al-Anwār* p. 4/44; *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 450 (narrations no. 848).

4 Ibn Taymiyyah: *Sharḥ Ḥadīth al-Nuzūl* p.6; Abū Saʿīd al-Dārimī: *Al-Radd ʿalā al-Jahmiyyah* p. 384; *Radd al-Imām ʿUthmān ibn Saʿīd ʿalā al-Murrīsī al-ʿAnīd* p. 377; Ibn Abī ʿĀṣim: *al-Sunnah* 1/216; *Sharḥ Uṣūl Iʿtiqād ahl al-Sunnah* 3/434.

However, there are many a narrations which feature in the books of the Twelvers which negate this.¹ Whereas simultaneously there are other narrations which establish the descent of Allah; these are the narrations which are in harmony with the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah. The following narration appears in the books of the Shī'ah:

قال سئل لأبي عبد الله: تقول إنه ينزل إلي السماء الدنيا؟ قال أبو عبد الله: نقول بذلك، لأن الروايات قد صحت به والأخبار

A person asked Abū 'Abd Allah, "Do you say that Allah descends to the first heaven?"

Abū 'Abd Allah said, "That is what we say, because this is what is authentically proven in the narrations and reports."²

A similar narration to this appears in *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, the most authentic and fundamental exegesis of the Shī'ah as is asserted by the author of *Al-Biḥār*,³ even though the publisher of the book and its commentator modified the meaning⁴ by adding on to it without realising, however, the rest of the narration exposes the counterfeit addition.⁵

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/125-127; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 3/311-314.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 3/331. Al-Majlisī has sourced this narration from *al-Tawḥīd* of Ibn Bābuwayh. Upon referring to the book I found the narration but with the portion affirming the descendance omitted. However, the reviser of the book has alluded to the presence of it in some manuscripts of the book in the footnotes. But he does not bring it in the book because it goes against his stance (See: *al-Tawḥīd* p. 248)

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 3/315.

4 He says, "His command descends." (See: *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/204).

5 For the narration goes as follows:

إن الرب تبارك و تعالي ينزل كل ليلة... فإذا طلع الفجر عاد الرب إلى عرشه

Verily the blessed and exalted lord descends every night... when the dawn breaks he returns to his throne.

(*Biḥār al-Anwār* 3/315; *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/204). It should be noted that the sentence, "Then he returns to his throne," is overstating this specific attribute of Allah.

The apparent contradiction in these narrations necessitates that one of them is undoubtedly false. And there is no doubt as to the fact that the narrations which are coherent with the Qur'ān, the Sunnah of the Rasūl ﷺ, and the unanimous stance of pious predecessors are the valid ones; despite the Shī'ah denying them due to their conformance with the Mu'tazilah.

In addition, the difference of opinion which we find between the early Shī'ī scholarship and its successive scholarship necessarily suggests that either the early or the later scholars were astray.¹ Narrations from the Shī'ī literature posit that the stance of the Ahl al-Bayt in this regard was one of moderation; not exaggeratedly affirming like that of the early Shī'ah and neither exceedingly denying like that of the later scholars.

The author of *al-Kāfī* has established a chapter, Chapter: Regarding the prohibition of describing Allah in a manner that he has not described himself. In this chapter he has cited twelve narrations from the Imāms. He commences the chapter with the following narration:

عبد الرحيم بن عتيك القصير قال كتبت علي يدي عبد الملك بن أعين إلي أبي عبد الله عليه السلام إن قوما بالعراق يصفون الله بالصورة وبالتخطيط فكتب إلي سألت رحمك الله عن التوحيد وما ذهب إليه من قبلك فتعال الله الذي ليس كمثل شيء وهو السميع البصير تعالي عما يصفه الواصفون المشبهون الله بخلقه المفترون علي الله فاعلم رحمك الله أن المذهب الصحيح في التوحيد ما نزل به القرآن من صفات الله جل وعز فانف عن الله تعالي البطلان و التشبيه فلا نفي ولا تشبيه... لا تعدوا القرآن فتضلوا بعد البيان

'Abd al-Rahmān ibn 'Atīk al-Qaṣīr mentions, "I dictated the following to 'Abd al-Malik ibn A'yan in a letter to Abū 'Abd Allah عليه السلام, 'A group of people in Iraq describe Allah with a form and with elaborate details.'

He wrote back saying, 'You have asked, may Allah have mercy on you, about the oneness of Allah and the view that some have adopted in your region. So Allah is exalted, there is nothing like him, he is All Hearing and All

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/275.

Seeing. He is beyond the descriptions of those who describe Him, likening Him to the creation, and who falsely forge things against Him. Behold! The correct stance pertaining to the oneness of Allah is that which the Qur’ān has descended with regarding the attributes of Allah ﷻ. Hence, negate from Allah ﷻ *Būtlān* (baselessness) and *Tashbīh* (assimilation). There is no room, thus, for complete negation of his attributes. Neither is there any permissibility for likening him with the creation...¹ Do not transgress the limits of the Qur’ān, or else you will go astray after clear guidance.”²

Mufaḍḍal says:

سألت أبا الحسن عن شيء من الصفة فقال: لا تجاوز ما في القرآن

I asked Abū al-Ḥasan about an aspect pertaining to the attributes of Allah.

He said, “Do not exceed that which is in the Qur’ān.”³

Note that this text which appears in the most authentic of their four early canonical works orders them to follow that which is revealed in the Qur’ān with regards to the attributes of Allah ﷻ. Therefore, whoever uncritically follows the Mu‘tazilah or makes his reason the criterion and turns away from the Qur’ān has not followed the Qur’ān, nor has he followed the bequest of his Imām.

1 The stance of the Salaf is a moderate stance between two extreme stances and guidance between two deviations, i.e. affirming the attributes of Allah ﷻ coupled with the denial of his assimilation with the creation. So the verse: ‘There is nothing like him’ is a refutation of those who assimilate Allah ﷻ with the creation. And the verse, ‘And He is All Hearing and All Seeing,’ is a refutation of those who negate his attributes (*Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām*; 5/196). However, the word *Tashbīh* (assimilation) has now become a very vague word; at times the correct meaning is intended and that is negating what the Qur’ān has negated and is rationally supported, i.e. none of the creation can be described with the attributes of Allah, nor is any of the creation like Him in any of his attributes. And at times the incorrect meaning is intended, and that is denying the attributes of Allah ﷻ completely. (*Sharḥ al-Taḥāwīyyah* p. 40)

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/100.

3 *Ibid* 1/102.

Al-Riḍā says:

للناس في التوحيد ثلاثة مذاهب: نفي، و تشبيه، و إثبات بغير تشبيه. فمذهب النفي لا يجوز، و مذهب التشبيه لا يجوز، لأن الله تبارك و تعالي لا يشبهه شيء و السبيل في الطريقة الثلاثة إثبات بلا تشبيه.

People have three opinions with regards to the oneness of Allah: Complete denial of His attributes, assimilating Him with the creation, and affirming them without assimilating Him with the creation. Hence, the stances of denial and assimilation are unacceptable, for there is nothing that resembles Allah. Therefore the straight path is in the third stance which is affirmation without assimilation.¹

The early Shī'ah leaned toward assimilation and the later Shī'ah leaned toward denial and they all collectively discarded the moderate stance which was the stance of the Imāms as is attested to by their books. This shows that they have no sound grounding in this regard, for they have not taken the approach of the Qur'ān and the Sunnah, nor have they adopted the stance of their Imāms who they claim are their leaders. Instead they first went the way of the assimilators and opposed the verse, "There is nothing like him," then they treaded the path of the deniers and disregarded all the texts containing the attributes of Allah

سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 3/263.

Discussion Three

Describing their Imāms with the Names and Attributes of Allah

This is something exclusive to the Shī'ah wherein they are isolated from the rest of the Ummah. The early scholars from among the Shī'ah attributed to Allah ﷻ the features of the creation. Subsequently, this was followed by a diametrically opposite stance which can be deemed as its counter, and that is the stance of *Ta'tīl* (denial). Hence, they assimilated Allah ﷻ with non-existent, inanimate and impossible objects thereby refuting and denying the texts containing his names and attributes.

As a result, they did not describe Allah ﷻ in the manner he described himself nor in the manner that the Rasūl ﷺ described Him. Not in their first standing and not in their second. And if this is really the case then they haven't stopped there. Instead the matter has escalated to the extent that they have ascribed to their Imāms some of the attributes which are exclusive to Allah ﷻ; giving birth to a third stance which is assimilating the creation with the creator—resembling the Christians, just as they, in turn, resembled the Jews.

They have contrived an innovation in the Ummah of Muḥammad ﷺ by claiming that their Imāms are the *Asmā'* (names) of Allah ﷻ; for they aver that the names of Allah ﷻ mentioned in the Qur'ān refer to their twelve Imāms. This entails denying the names of Allah ﷻ and according them to the creation. They also claim that there is emphatic mention of this from the infallibles. This is a blatant lie, so woe be to them due to their fabrications. Al-Kulaynī narrates in *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*:

عن أبي عبد الله في قول الله عز وجل: (و لله الأسماء الحسنى فادعوه بها) قال: نحن والله الأسماء الحسنى التي لا يقبل الله من العباد عملا إلا بمعرفتنا

Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ṣādiq states regarding the verse, And Allah has beautiful names so call unto him by way of them.¹ “We are the names of Allah

1 Sūrah al-A'rāf: 180.

without the recognition of whom Allah will not accept any deed from his servants.”¹

This subject matter has been narrated by the founding fathers of the dogma who all narrate it from Ja‘far al-Šādiq and others.²

Allah سبحانه وتعالى says, “And for Allah there are beautiful names.” And these people say, “We are the beautiful names.” Can there be any opposition to Allah and his book more blatant than this? It is from these contaminated sources that the *Bāṭiniyyah* (those who believe in esoteric knowledge rather than exoteric) and those who dieficate their Imāms draw, and from its dirty waters do they saturate themselves.

Some narrations unpack what has been vaguely transmitted in these reports. Hence they narrate from Abū Ja‘far that he said:

نحن وجه الله نتقلب في الارض بين أظهركم و نحن عين الله في خلقه و يده المبسوطة بالرحمة علي عباده عرفنا من عرفنا و جهلنا من جهلنا

We are the countenance of Allah who roams among you on the earth. We are the eye of Allah in his creation. We are His hand of mercy which has been spread out to the creation. Those who have recognised us have recognised us and those who are ignorant of us are ignorant of us.³

Another narration from Abū ‘Abd Allāh states:

و عن أني عبد الله (إن الله خلقنا فأحسن صورنا وجعلنا عينه في عباده، ولسانه الناطق في خلقه، و يده المبسوطة علي عباده بالرأفة و الرحمة، ووجهه الذي يؤتي منه، وبابه الذي يدل عليه و خزانة في سماؤه و أرضه، بنا أثمرت الأشجار و أينعت الثمار، و جرت الانهار، و بنا ينزل غيث السماء و ينبت عشب الأرض و بعبادتنا عبد الله و لولانا ما عبد الله

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/143-144.

2 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/42; *al-Ikhtisāṣ* p.252; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 94/22; *al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī: Mustadrak al-Wasā’il* 1/371; *al-Burhān* 2/52; *Tafsīr al-Šāfī* 2/254-255.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/143; *al-Burhān* 3/240.

Allah created us and perfected our creation and then made us His eye among his servants, His tongue amidst his creation, His hand that has been spread with compassion and mercy, His countenance wherefrom he is approached, His door which leads to him and His treasurers in the heavens and the earth. Through us do trees bear fruit, fruits ripen, rivers flow, rains pour and the earth gives of its proceeds. And it is due to our worship that Allah is worshipped. If it were not for us Allah would not have been worshipped.¹

Likewise, they allege that Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī عليه السلام said:

و زعموا أن أمير المؤمنين عليا قال: (أنا عين الله و أنا يد الله و أنا جنب الله و أنا باب الله

I am the hand of Allah, I am the side of Allah, and I am the door of Allah.²

He also said (as they allege):

و قال كما يفترون- أنا علم الله و أنا قلب الله الواعي، و لسان الله الناطق، و عين الله الناطره، و أنا جنب الله و أنا يد الله

I am the knowledge of Allah, I am the retaining heart of Allah, the speaking tongue of Allah, the observing eye of Allah, the side of Allah, and the hand of Allah.³

In *al-Tawhīd* of Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī Abū 'Abd Allāh is narrated to have said:

إن لله عز و جل خلقا من رحمته، خلقه من نوره... فهم عين الله الناطره و اذنه السامعة نو لسانه الناطق في خلقه بإذنه... بهم يحو السيئات، و بهم يدفع الضيم، و بهم ينزل الرحمة، و بهم يحيي ميتا، و بهم يميت حيا، و بهم يتلي خلقه، و بهم يقضي في خلقه قضيته

Verily for Allah there is a creation from His divine mercy; He has created them from His light... they are His observing eye, His hearing ear, and His

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/144; *al-Tawhīd* p.151; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/197; *al-Burhān* 3/240-241.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/145; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/194.

3 *al-Tawhīd* p.164; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/198.

speaking tongue amidst His creation... Through them does He omit evil, suppresses oppression, sends down mercy, revives the dead, gives death to those who are alive, tests His creation, and decrees His intention regarding them.¹

Al-Majlisī has quoted thirty six traditions which purport that the Imāms are the countenance of Allah and his hand.² The following is reported from ‘Alī عليه السلام in *Rijāl al-Kashshī*:

أنا وجه الله أنا جنب الله أنا الاول و أنا الآخر و أنا الظاهر و أنا الباطن

I am the countenance of Allah, the side of Allah, the First, the Last, the Apparent, the Hidden.³

Similarly, there are many a narrations in several of their sources which explain the following verses:

وَيَبْقَى وَجْهُ رَبِّكَ ذُو الْجَلَالِ وَالْإِكْرَامِ

Only the countenance of your Rabb the majestic and benevolent will remain.⁴

كُلُّ شَيْءٍ هَالِكٌ إِلَّا وَجْهَهُ

Everything but his countenance will perish.⁵

With narrations which they narrate from Imām Ja‘far such as:

1 *al-Tawhīd* p.167.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/191-203.

3 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 211; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 94/180; *Baṣā‘ir al-Darajāt* p. 151.

4 *Sūrah al-Raḥmān*: 27.

5 *Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ*: 88.

نحن وجه الله

We are the countenance of Allah.¹

نحن الوجه الذي يؤتي الله منه

We are the countenance of Allah wherefrom he is approached.²

نحن وجه الله الذي لا يهلك

We are the countenance of Allah which will perish.³

There are many other narrations of this nature.⁴

In *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* there appears a narration which makes the bodies of the believers quiver; it describes the happenings of the Day of Judgment. The end of the narration states the following:

ثم يؤتي بنا فتجلس علي عرش ربنا

Then we will be summoned and we will be made to sit upon the ‘Arsh of Allah.⁵

We seek the protection of Allah from such a slander and fabrication.

Furthermore, their texts which explain the names and attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى with the Imāms are found in abundance. Similarly, they have accorded the Imāms some of the exclusive attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, such as having knowledge of the unseen. The author of *al-Kāfī* has established a chapter in this regard, Chapter:

1 This narration was cited previously.

2 This narration was cited previously.

3 *al-Tawhīd* p. 150; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/201; *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 4/108; *al-Burhān* 3/241.

4 *al-Tawhīd* p. 149-153; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/191; *al-Burhān* 30/240-242: there are thirteen narrations from various books of the Shī‘ah in *al-Burhān* which convey this message.

5 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/312; *al-Burhān* 2/439; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 3/302.

Regarding the Imāms having knowledge of the past and the future, and that nothing is hidden from them.¹ In this chapter he has included a number of narrations. Likewise, he has established another chapter with the title, Chapter: The Imāms acquire knowledge when they intend to do so. Hereunder as well he has mentioned many a narrations. One of the narrations reads as follows:

قال أبو عبد الله -كما يفترون- إني لأعلم ما في السماوات وما في الأرض وأعلم ما في الجنة وأعلم ما في النار، وأعلم ما كان وما يكون

Abū ‘Abd Allāh says, “Most certainly I know what is in the heavens and what is on the earth. I know what is in Jannah and what is in Jahannam. I know what transpired in the past and what is to ensue in the future.”

وعن سيف التمار قال: كنا مع أبي عبد الله رضي الله عنه جماعة من الشيعة في الحجر فقال: علينا عين؟ فالتفتنا يمنة ويسرة فلم نر أحداً، فقلنا ليس علينا عين فقال: ورب الكعبة ورب البنية ثلاث مرات لو كنت بين موسى والخضر لأخبرتهما أنني أعلم منهما ولأنبأتهما بما ليس في أيديهما، لأن موسى والخضر عليهما السلام أعطيا علم ما كان ولم يعطيا علم ما يكون وما هو كائن حتى تقوم الساعة، وقد ورثناه من رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وراثته

Sayf al-Tammār relates that he and a group of the Shī‘ah, were with Abū ‘Abd Allāh in the Ḥijr (the area around the Ka‘bah where Ismā‘īl عليه السلام is buried).

Abū ‘Abd Allāh said, “Is there a spy watching us?”

We looked to the right and to the left and did not spot anyone so we informed him that there is no spy watching us. Thereupon he said, “By the Lord of the Ka‘bah and the Lord of this structure (three times)! If I were between Mūsā and Khid̄r I would inform them that I am more knowledgeable than them, and I would inform them of what is in their hands. Because they were granted the knowledge of previous events, not of future happenings, nor of things to happen till the emergence of Qiyāmah. Whereas we have inherited that from the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ.”²

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 1/260-262.

2 Ibid 1/258.

Nevertheless, these words do not require any comments. They are the remnants of the esoteric sects which had some appearance in the history of Islam; who believed in the deification of 'Alī and the Imāms. The Twelvers have included them all in the very edifice of their dogma.

They project all of this to the Ahl al-Bayt in order to use them as a springboard by the aid of which they can spread their erroneous ideas. Or else why would someone say, "I am the First, the Last, the Apparent, and the Hidden." Is there any difference between him and Fir'awn who claimed, "I am your supreme lord?" And how can the leading Shī'ī scholars, the likes of al-Kashshī and al-Ṭūsī, narrate such blasphemous beliefs. And how can the Shī'ah consider al-Kulaynī to be a reliable narrator when he narrates such blatant heresies. Is there any excuse for any apologetic?

Nonetheless, Al-Majlisī, their supreme Shaykh, has resorted to metaphor in trying to explain some of their texts in this regard. He says,

إن تلك المجازات شائعة في كلام العرب فيقال لفلان وجه عند الناس، ولفلان يد علي فلان وأمثال ذلك والوجه يطلق علي الجهة، فالأئمة الجهة التي أمر الله بالتوجه إليها، ولا يتوجه إليه تعالي إلا بالتوجه إليهم، وكل شيء هالك باطل مضمحل إلا دينهم وطريقتهم وطاعتهم، وهم عين الله أي شاهده علي عباد، فكما أن الرجل ينظر بعينه ليطلع علي الأمور فكذلك خلقهم الله ليكونوا شهداء من الله عليهم ناظرين في أمورهم. وإطلاق اليد علي النعمة والرحمة والقدرة شائع فهم نعمة الله التامة، ورحمته المبسوطة، ومظاهر قدرته الكاملة، والجنب: الجانب والناحية وهم الجانب الذي أمر الخلق بالتوجه إليهم... ويحتمل أن يكون كناية عن أن قرب الله تعالي لا يحصل إلا بالتقرب بهم، كما أن قرب الملك يكون بجنبه.

These metaphors are very frequently used in the Arabic language. It is said, "so-and-so has a *Wajh* (good social standing) with the people," and "so-and-so has a favourable hand over so-and-so," among other examples. Sometimes the word *Wajh* (lit. face) is translated as direction. Hence the Imāms are the direction which Allah has ordered us to face; a person cannot truly be devoted to Allah if he is not devoted to the Imāms. Everything is going to perish and be doomed to destruction besides their creed, their path, and obedience to them. And they are the eye of Allah,

i.e. the witnesses of Allah upon his servants; hence, just as a person sees with his eyes in order to grasp things, likewise, Allah created them so that they be his witnesses over the creation and see into their affairs. The use of the word *Yad* (lit. hand) in the meaning of bounty, mercy, and ability is widespread, hence, they are the complete bounty of Allah, his enveloping mercy, and the manifestation of his complete power. As for the word *Janb* (lit. side) it means angle or direction, and they are the direction that Allah has ordered the creation to face. It is also possible that it implies that proximity to Allah can only be attained through proximity to them (just as the close associate of a king is always by his side).¹

This apologetic approach is an indication that their scholars are satisfied with this outright disbelief. Or else why would someone search for a way out from such blatant heterodoxy? Why did al-Majlisī not discard it completely and why did he not cleanse the garb of Shī'ism from the defilement of the leading heretics and the lords of disbelief? Al-Majlisī's interpretation can only be valid if the interpretation of Fir'awn's claim, "I am your supreme lord," is proven to be valid as well. Otherwise, this is merely a camouflage of falsehood and an egotistic defence of the heretics' verdicts and stances.

A metaphorical meaning, if it is assumed that it was intended², cannot be applied at this juncture. For in order to apply a metaphorical meaning there has to be a link between the actual literal meaning and the metaphorical one, coupled with the presence of a clear indicator which makes the actual meaning inapplicable.³ The literal meaning is primary; the metaphorical meaning will not be applied unless the literal meaning is practically inapplicable.⁴

Therefore, we find that many sub-sects of the Twelvers have taken these statements in their literal sense, the result of which is that they deified the

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/202

2 *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 7/87-119; *Mukhtaṣar al-Ṣawā'iq al-Muḥriqah* p. 242.

3 Al-Marāghī: *Ulūm al-Balāghah* p. 296; Ḥafī Nāṣif and company: *al-Balāghah* p. 341.

4 Abū Shāmmah: *Ḍaw' al-Sārī* p. 106.

Imāms due to the purport of these heresies which the scholars of the Twelvers have transmitted to them. These statements actually deserved to be discarded and belied, for there is no reason to resort to metaphor. Can there possibly be any indicator which allows the attribution of the attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى to the Imāms? Where is the indicator in their statement that the names of Allah, viz. *al-Awwal* (the first), *al-Ākhir* (the last), *al-Zāhir* (the Apparent) and *al-Bāṭin* (the Hidden), are traits of the Imāms? With regards to the verse, “Allah has beautiful names so call unto him by way of them,” where is the indicator which averts this verse from its literal meaning—i.e. the names of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى? There is no such indicator unless it is their claim that the Imāms share a portion of the divinity of Allah. Hence al-Kulaynī has documented the following narration:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ خَلَطَنَا بِنَفْسِهِ

Allah has mingled us with himself.¹

If this is the indicator, then it establishes their exaggeration and does not deny it. And it accords the Imāms a portion of the attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. You will notice that the commentary of al-Majlisī suggests exaggeration with regards to the Imāms and is almost an echo of those extreme narrations.

So is it possible to draw a comparison between the proverb of the Arabs: So-and-so has a face (status) among people and the alleged statement of the Imām, “I am the face of Allah,” and would it be fine to assert that the link between the two is that ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the Imāms are the direction which Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has instructed us to face? Do they have any evidence in this regard which they can furnish for us?

People do not turn but to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى in their devotions and supplications, and do not face but the House of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى in their prayers. There are no intermediaries between Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and His creation except in the aspect of conveying His revelation to them, and those intermediaries were none other

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/146.

than the Prophets of guidance عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام; every person besides the Rasūl of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is such that some of his views are worth approval and some not. So how is it then possible to claim that the Imāms are the direction to which the people are obligated to face?

As to the claim, “The Imāms know what happened and what is to happen and that nothing is concealed from them,” this is an attribute of Allah سُبحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى which is exclusive to him. Allah سُبحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

قُلْ لَا يَعْلَمُ مَنْ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ الْغَيْبَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ

Say, “No one besides Allah has knowledge of the unseen in the heavens and the earth.”¹

وَعِنْدَهُ مَفَاتِحُ الْغَيْبِ لَا يَعْلَمُهَا إِلَّا هُوَ

And by him are the keys of the unseen, no one besides him possess knowledge thereof.²

إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَخْفَى عَلَيْهِ شَيْءٌ فِي الْأَرْضِ وَلَا فِي السَّمَاءِ

Verily Allah, nothing in the earth and heaven is concealed from him.³

And Allah سُبحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى ordered the best of his creation and the Prophet of guidance to say:

وَلَوْ كُنْتُ أَعْلَمُ الْغَيْبَ لَاسْتَكْتَرْتُ مِنَ الْخَيْرِ وَمَا مَسَّنِيَ السُّوءُ

And if I possessed knowledge of the unseen I would have sought good in abundance and no evil would have come my way.⁴

1 Sūrah al-Naml: 65.

2 Sūrah al-An‘ām: 59.

3 Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 5.

4 Sūrah al-A‘rāf: 188.

قُلْ لَا أَقُولُ لَكُمْ عِنْدِي خَزَائِنُ اللَّهِ وَلَا أَعْلَمُ الْغَيْبَ

Say, “I do not say to you that I have the treasures of Allah and I do not have knowledge of the unseen.”¹

So Allah ﷻ ordered him to handover all his affairs to Him and that he inform the people that he does not possess knowledge of the unseen nor does he have any information regarding it with the exception of that which Allah ﷻ reveals to him as Allah ﷻ states:

عَالِمُ الْغَيْبِ فَلَا يُظْهِرُ عَلَى غَيْبِهِ أَحَدًا إِلَّا مَنِ ارْتَضَىٰ مِنْ رَسُولٍ

He is the knower of the unseen. Hence he does not inform anyone of it besides those whom he selects, i.e. a Messenger.²

The scholars have stated that whoever lays claim to any aspect of the knowledge of the unseen is out of the fold. For Allah ﷻ has attributed the knowledge of the unseen to Himself specifically in many verses of the Noble Qur’ān; He does not, thus, inform anyone about it beside his chosen Messengers.³ And this is the true knowledge of the unseen which has been barred from the creation.⁴

1 Sūrah al-An’ām: 50.

2 Sūrah al-Jinn: 26, 27. The text is from the *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 2/293.

3 *Tafsīr al-Qurṭubī* 7/2-3.

4 The scholars have categorised the knowledge of the unseen into two:

Completely unseen: which is the knowledge which only Allah ﷻ possesses. This is what is meant by ‘completely unseen’ and it is regarding this type of knowledge that Allah ﷻ says, “Say: no one in the heavens and the earth has knowledge of the unseen besides Allah.” And relatively unseen: which is the knowledge that some might have while others do not. E.g. the angels have knowledge of their realm which humans do not or for example that some humans have with regards to usage of some means which other humans do not have. So this is not included in the purport of the ‘unseen’ which is mentioned in the Qur’ān (which is the exclusive domain of Allah) because it is only ‘unseen’ considering the individuals who don’t possess it but it is attainable knowledge for those who possess it. All people are such that they are unaware of things which others are aware of so this will relatively unseen and not completely unseen. (*Majmū’ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 16/110; *Tafsīr al-Manār* 7/422.)

Amidst all these heterodox and foolish claims with regards to the Imāms, I came across some narrations in the books of the Shī'ah which strip the Imāms of these attributes which are only appropriate for Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. Abū 'Abd Allāh says (as the author of *al-Kāfī* narrates):

يا عجبا لأقوام يزعمون أنا نعلم الغيب. ما يعلم الغيب إلا الله عز وجل. لقد هممت بضرب جارياتي فلانة فهربت مني فما علمت في أي بيوت الدار هي...

Eerie indeed are those who claim that we have knowledge of the unseen. Only Allah has knowledge of the unseen. I intended to hit my slave girl so-and-so, thus she ran away and I do not know in which of the rooms of the house she is hiding.¹

If Abū 'Abd Allāh really had knowledge of the future and nothing was concealed from him, and if he really could attain knowledge whenever he desired, as al-Kulainī proves by establishing chapters in this regard after citing this narration, then the place of the slave girl would not have been concealed on him.

The Imāms would always complain regarding the false claims of such people, whose statements are compiled by the author of *al-Kāfī* and which he has attributed to the Imāms. Therefore, it appears in a narration cited by the author of *Al-Biḥār* and the author of *al-Iḥtijāj* that some of the Imāms said:

تعالى الله عز وجل عما يصفون سبحانه وبحمده، ليس نحن شركاء في علمه ولا في قدرته، بل لا يعلم الغيب غيره كما قال في محكم كتابه تبارك وتعالى: قُلْ لَا يَعْلَمُ مَنْ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ الْغَيْبَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ... قد آذانا جهلاء الشيعة وحماؤهم، ومن دينه جناح البعوضة أرجح منه، أشهد الله الذي لا إله إلا هو وكفى به شهيدا... أني بريء إلي الله وإلى رسوله ممن يقول: أنا نعلم الغيب أو نشارك الله في ملكه أو يحلنا محلا سوي المحل الذي رضىه الله لنا.

Exalted is Allah from what they ascribe to him. We are not His partners in His knowledge and power. Instead no one knows the unseen besides Him as He has mentioned in his divine revelation, "Say: No one in the heavens and

¹ *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/257.

the earth know the unseen besides Allah.” The ignorant and the foolish of the Shī‘ah have harmed us. The one who subscribes to the creed of the wing of a mosquito is weightier than this. I make Allah my witness, the one besides Who there is no deity, and Allah is sufficient a witness... I am free before Allah and His Rasūl from any person who says, “We know the unseen or that we are partners with Him in his kingdom or that He will station us in a position other than the position He selected for us.”

Hence, we see that the narrations of the Shī‘ah expose what is contained within them by themselves and they contradict each other as well.

And the claim of the Imāms that they are the source of sustenance and rain, etc., as well as many such claims which are narrated by the scholars of the Twelvers are the remnants of the extremists among them whose ideologies were rejected by the Imāms. It has appeared in their narrations that when Abū ‘Abd Allāh was told:

إن المفضل بن عمرو يقول: إنكم تقدرون أرزاق العباد

Mufaḍḍal ibn ‘Amr says, “You destine the sustenance of the bondsmen.”

He said:

والله ما يقدر أرزاقنا إلا الله. ولقد احتجت إلي الطعام لعيالي فضاق صدري وأبلغت إلي الفكرة في ذلك حتي أحرزت قوتهم فعندها طابت نفسي. لعنه الله وبرئ منه.

By the oath of Allah! No one but Allah decrees our sustenance. I needed food for my family due to which I was uneasy. My concern induced a solution for me after which eventually I managed to amass provisions for them. Then only did I feel relieved. May Allah curse him and be free from him.”¹

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/301; *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 323. See a similar narration in *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/32; *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 324-325. Likewise refer to: *Biḥār* 25/316; *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 518-519.

These narrations are, however, like a white hair upon a black ox. In Taqiyyah there is a loophole for every narration which induces unrest upon the scholars of the Shī'ah. If you want an example, then listen to what the commentator of *al-Kāfī* has to say regarding the narration I cited above shortly (wherein Abū 'Abd Allāh expresses his astonishment at people who ascribe the knowledge of the unseen to him. After which he, in refuting that, mentions that his slave girl hid away in the house and he did not know where she was, implying that how can the knowledge of past and the future, then, be attributed to him). The commentator of *al-Kāfī* says:

والغرض من هذا التعجب وإظهاره ألا يتخذ الجهال إلهاء، أو يدفع عن وهم بعض الحاضرين المنكر لفضله ما نسبوه إليه من العلم بالغيب حفظاً لنفسه. وإلا فهو رضي الله عنه كان عالماً بما كان وما يكون فكيف يخفي عليه مكان الجارية. فإن قلت: إخباره بذلك علي هذا يوجب الكذب. قلت: إنما يوجب الكذب لو لم يقصد التورية وقد قصدوها، فإن المعني ما علمت علماً غير مستفاد منه تعالى بأنها في أي بيوت الدار.

The reason for this astonishment and its expression is to prevent the laymen from deifying him. Or, in order to save himself, he said that to eliminate the suspicion of a person who was present who did not concede his virtue. Otherwise, he possessed the knowledge of the past and of the future so how would the hiding spot of the slave girl be obscure to him. If you say, "For him to give information of this sort necessitates him lying." My reply is: It would only necessitate a lie if he did not intend dissimulation whereas he intended it; because he meant to say: I did not know, via a medium of knowledge other than Allah, in which of the rooms of the house she was.¹

How weird indeed is this obscure interpretation in order to refute this narration and prove that the Imām had knowledge of the past and the future. So much so that he went on to ascribe a lie to the Imām and in doing so, destroyed one of their principal beliefs which is the infallibility of the Imāms.

If the Imāms intent by this statement as alleged was to prevent the laymen from deifying him then is it your endeavour—through your affirmation—to invite

1 Al-Māzindarānī: *Sharḥ al-jāmi'* 6/30-31.

towards his deification? And where is the evidence that there was a person present whom the Imām feared whereas the chain of transmission consists of Shī'ah alone? And on the basis of which law of language can this be considered dissimulation?

As for al-Sha'rānī, another scholar of theirs who added additional notes to the commentary, he was not impressed with this wild interpretation of the narration. Therefore, he concluded that the narration is a fabrication.¹

And like this, the heretics propagate these false beliefs in the name of the Ahl al-Bayt. Then when they (the Ahl al-Bayt) debunk their fabrications and expose their falsity before the masses, the scholars of the Shī'ah interpret their denial as Taqiyyah. Taqiyyah has thus become a ploy which the extremists deploy in order to keep Shī'ism in the confines of extremism, denial of the truth, and disrespect to the Ahl al-Bayt.

Zurārah ibn A'yan had claimed that Ja'far ibn Muḥammad had knowledge of the people of Jannah and the people of Jahannam. Ja'far refuted this claim when it reached him and considered its proponent to be out of the fold. However when Zurārah was told of this he said to the person, “

لقد عمل معك بالتقية

He has practiced Taqiyyah with you.²

1 *Ta'ālīq 'Ilmiyyahi* 6/31.

2 *Mīzān al-I'tidāl*: biography of Zurārah 2/69-70.

Discussion Four

Interpolation in Order to Support Their Stance of Denial

This is adopted by none besides them and is an isolated view exclusive to them. For they, in order to obfuscate the verses containing the names and attributes of Allah ﷻ in the Qur'ān, have made a grave claim (which we have dealt with in detail in the previous chapters). We are going to very briefly suffice on what is linked directly with the subject of the names of Allah ﷻ and his attributes. This claim is the claim of *Tahrif* (interpolation) in some of the verse. For example, Ibn Bābuwayh reports the following from 'Alī ibn Mūsā al-Riḍā regarding the verse:

هَلْ يَنْظُرُونَ إِلَّا أَنْ يَأْتِيَهُمُ اللَّهُ فِي ظُلَلٍ مِنَ الْغَمَامِ وَالْمَلَائِكَةُ وَقُضِيَ الْأَمْرُ وَإِلَى اللَّهِ تُرْجَعُ الْأُمُورُ

They are not waiting but for Allah and the angels to come to them in the shadows of clouds and for matters to be decided. And to him do all affairs return.¹

إنها هل ينظرون إلا أن يأتيهم الله بالملائكة في ظلل من الغمام وهكذا نزلت

The verse actually is: 'They are not anticipating but that Allah sends to them angels in shadows of clouds.' And this is how it was revealed.²

The intent of the Shī'ah is quite clear from this interpolation; they intend to negate from Allah ﷻ his 'coming' just like the Mu'tazilah. In *al-Ihtijāj* of al-Ṭabarsī Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is reported to have addressed one of the heretics with the following in order to convince him about Islam:

وأما قوله: كُلُّ شَيْءٍ هَالِكٌ إِلَّا وَجْهَهُ فَإِنَّمَا نَزَلَتْ كُلُّ شَيْءٍ هَالِكٌ إِلَّا دِينَهُ، لأن من المحال أن يهلك منه كل شيء ويبقى الوجه، هو أجل وأعظم من ذلك

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 210.

2 *al-Tawhīd* p. 163; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 3/319; *al-Burhān* 1/208.

And as for the verse, “Everything will perish but His countenance.” It was revealed as: everything besides his dīn will perish; for it is impossible that everything of His besides his countenance will perish. He is far more exalted and great than that.¹

It is evident that the fabricator of this narration is ignorant, unacquainted with any aspect of the Arabic language, and an inveterate heretic out to accuse the Book of Allah, to deny the attributes of Allah ﷻ, and then attribute that to Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. The extent of his stratagem lies in the fact that he claims that ‘Alī رضي الله عنه responded in this manner in order to satisfy one of the heretics.

This approach suggests that this particular sect, which has forged these narrations, does not honour any sanctity in trying to defend its principals and knows no bounds in this regard.

All the sects that had denied the attributes of Allah ﷻ, among whom were the Mu’tazilah, never endeavoured to adulterate even a word of the book of Allah; they resorted to metaphorical interpretations. This sect, however, has exceeded all limits and violated all the key principles of Islam, thus taking them out of the fold of Islam. This clearly shows that some of the sects that deny the attributes of Allah are out there to conspire against this Ummah by attacking the very basis of its dīn, i.e. the book of Allah ﷻ. Their ploy has, nonetheless, been exposed and they are now humiliated. Allah ﷻ is well aware of what they do.

1 *al-Ihtijāj* p. 253.

Chapter Four

Their Belief Regarding Īmān and its Fundamentals

In this chapter I will present two discussions:

- Their view with regards to Īmān, the promises, and warnings of Allah ﷻ,
- Their view regarding the fundamentals of Īmān.

In the first discussion, five aspects will be discussed:

1. The definition of Īmān according to the Shī'ah.
2. A third *Shahādah* (testimony of faith) with the *Shahādatayn* (testimonies of faith).
3. Their belief in *Irjā'* (violation of the commands of Allah is of no consequence if a person has Īmān).
4. Their view regarding the promises of Allah.
5. Their view regarding the warnings of Allah.

And in the second discussion I will shed light upon their belief in the fundamentals of Īmān.

Discussion One

Their view regarding Īmān, the promises, and warnings of Allah

1. Their definition of Īmān:

The Ithnā 'Ashariyyah have included believing in the Twelve Imāms in the definition of Īmān.¹ In fact, they have considered it to be Īmān itself. In *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* the following narration appears:

1 Al-Ash'arī has classed this to be the doctrine of majority of the Shī'ah. (*Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/125)

الإسلام هو الظاهر الذي عليه الناس: شهادة أن لا إله إلا الله وحده لا شريك له وأن محمدا عبده ورسوله... الإيمان معرفة هذا الأمر مع هذا، فإن أقر بها ولم يعرف هذا الأمر كان مسلما و كان ضالا

Islam is what we see prevalent in the lives of the people, viz. testifying that there is no deity but Allah, who has no partners, and that Muḥammad is his servant and Messenger... (Thereafter he makes mention of the remaining fundamentals thereof and then states,) Īmān is recognising this aspect [that the Imāms are divinely appointed] with that; if a person accepts them without acknowledging this aspect he will be a Muslim but he will be deviated.¹

They also aver that reward in the hereafter is not purely upon Islam, rather upon īmān. The author of *al-Kāfī* has established a chapter with the title, Amnesty of life is due to Islam and reward will be in lieu of īmān. Concerning the following verse:

قُولُوا آمَنَّا بِاللَّهِ وَمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْنَا وَمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَىٰ إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَإِسْمَاعِيلَ وَإِسْحَاقَ وَيَعْقُوبَ وَالْأَسْبَاطِ وَمَا أُوتِيَ مُوسَىٰ وَعِيسَىٰ وَمَا أُوتِيَ النَّبِيُّونَ مِن رَّبِّهِمْ لَا نُفَرِّقُ بَيْنَ أَحَدٍ مِّنْهُمْ وَنَحْنُ لَهُ مُسْلِمُونَ فَإِنْ أُمِنُوا بِمِثْلِ مَا أُمِنْتُمْ بِهِ فَقَدْ اهْتَدَوْا وَإِنْ تَوَلَّوْا فَإِنَّمَا هُمْ فِي شِقَاقٍ

Say, “We have brought faith in Allah, in that which is revealed to us, in that which was revealed to Ibrāhīm, Ismā‘īl, Ishāq, Ya‘qūb and the descendants, in that which was given to Mūsā and ‘Īsā, and that which the rest of the prophets were given from their Lord. We do not differentiate between any of them and we are Muslims [in submission] to Him. If they bring faith just as you brought faith they are rightly guided and if they turn away, they are only in dissension.²

They render the interpretation:

عن أبي جعفر قال: إنما عني بذلك عليا، والحسن، والحسين، وفاطمة. وجرع بعدهم في الأئمة. قال: ثم يرجع القول من الله في الناس فقال: (فإن آمنوا) يعني الناس، (بمثل ما آمنتم به) يعني عليا وفاطمة والحسن والحسين والأئمة من بعدهم، (فقد اهتدوا وإن تولوا فإنما هم في شقاق)

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/24.

2 *Sūrah al-Baqarah*: 136, 137.

Abū Ja‘far al-Bāqir says, “‘Alī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, and Fāṭimah are meant in this verse. After them the same applies to the Imāms.”

He then said, “Then Allah addresses the people and says, “If they (the people) bring faith just as you have, i.e. ‘Alī, Fāṭimah, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, and the Imāms that followed, they will be rightly guided and if they turn away, they are only in dissension.”¹

Therefore Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī states the following:

إن مسألة الإمامة (إمامة الاثني عشر) هي أحد أركان الإيمان المستحق بسببه الخلود في الجنان والتخلص من غضب الرحمن

The issue of Imāmah (the leadership of the Twelve Imāms) is one of the fundamentals of īmān due to which a person will become worthy of everlasting bliss in Jannah and will be freed from the punishment of the Merciful.²

Muḥammad Jawwād al-‘Āmilī states the following:

الإيمان عندنا إنما يتحقق بالإعتراف بإمامة الأئمة الإثني عشر عليهم السلام، إلا من مات في عهد احدهم فلا يشترط في إيمانه إلا معرفة إمام زمانه و من قبله

Īmān according to us is established when the Imāmah of the Twelve Imāms is acknowledged, with the exception of a person who lived in the era of one of the Imāms; it will suffice for him to acknowledge the Imām of his time and the Imām before him.³

Amīr Muḥammad al-Qazwīnī (one of their contemporary scholars) says:

إن من يكفر بولاية علي وإمامته رضي الله عنه فقد اسقط إيمان من حسابه و أحبط بذلك عمله

1 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 1/62; *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/92; *al-Burhān* 1/157.

2 *Minhāj al-Karāmah fī Ma‘rifah al-Imāmah* p. 1.

3 *Miftāḥ al-Karāmah* 2/80.

Whoever denies the Wilāyah and the Imāmah of ‘Alī has discarded his faith and thereby destroyed his actions.¹

2. The third testimony of faith

Naturally, due to the nature of their faith which is unknown but to them, they have contrived a third testimony of faith which is the hallmark of this new definition of Īmān. It is:

أشهد أن عليا ولي الله

I testify that ‘Alī is the Walī of Allah.

They repeat this testimony in their adhān, after their ṣalāh, and they instruct their fatally ill to pronounce it. So acceptance of the Imāms together with the Shahādatayn is pronounced after every ṣalāh. Al-Hurr al-‘Āmilī has established an entire chapter to prove this.²

It appears in their narrations that Zurārah reported the following from Abū Ja‘far عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام al-Bāqir:

لو أدركت عكرمة عند الموت لنفعته، فقيل لأبي عبد الله عليه السلام: بماذا كان ينفعه؟ قال: يلقي من أتم عليه

“If I was to meet ‘Ikrimah³ before his death I would have benefitted him.”

Abū ‘Abd Allāh was asked as to how his father would benefit him.

He said, “By urging him to read what you believe.”⁴

1 *Al-Shī‘ah fī ‘Aqā’idihim wa Ahkāmihim* p. 24.

2 *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 4/1038, Chapter regarding the desirability of acknowledging the Imāms together with the Shahādatayn.

3 This refers to ‘Ikrimah the freed slave of Ibn ‘Abbās, a great scholar, narrator, and exegete (*Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 5/12). This is the value these people have for him (*Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 216: therein it is mentioned that this suggests denigration).

4 *Furū’ al-Kāfī* 1/34; *Man lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* 1/41; *Tahdhīb al-Ahkāim* 1/82; *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p.216; *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 2/665.

Abū Baṣīr narrates the following from Abū Ja‘far:

لَقِّنُوا مَوْتَكُمْ عِنْدَ الْمَوْتِ شَهَادَةً أَنْ لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا اللَّهُ وَالْوَلَايَةُ

Instruct your fatally ill to attest the Shahādatayn and Wilāyah at the time of death.¹

The deceased is instructed with the same when he is being entered into the grave,² likewise when the people are leaving. Al-Majlisī has established a chapter with the title, Chapter: Regarding the desirability of the relative instructing the deceased with the Shahādatayn and the acknowledgement of the Imāms together with their names after the leaving of the people,³ he has cited a few narrations therein.

This new testimony is a testimony regarding the doctrine of Imāmah regarding which Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī asserts the following:

أهم المطالب في أحكام الدين وأشرف مسائل المسلمين

The most important aspect of dīn and the noblest of the belief of the Muslims.⁴

In conclusion, considering the doctrine of the Twelve Imāms to be a fundamental component of Īmān, or Īmān itself, and the most important aspect of dīn; this is one of the unequivocal evidences and clear signs of the falsity of their dogma. And of the fact that they have inserted into the dīn of Allah that which He has not sanctioned as there is no evidence in this regard, neither in the Qur’ān or in the Sunnah.⁵ Therefore, Ibn Taymiyyah opined that the belief of Imāmah

1 *Furū’ al-Kāfi* 1/34; *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* 1/82; *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 2/665.

2 *Furū’ al-Kāfi* 1/53; *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* 1/91; *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 2/843.

3 *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 2/862.

4 *Minhāj al-Karāmah* p. 1.

5 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/20. More details will come in the chapter of Imāmah.

(just Imāmah, without taking into account their belief in the Imāmah of the Twelve Infallibles which is their exclusive position) amounts to disbelief and apostasy. Because it is categorically established that īmān in Allah ﷻ and His Messenger ﷺ are the pivotal parts of our dīn.¹

Furthermore if this is really the status of Imāmah according to them then the Shī'ah are the furthest away from adherence to it. For according to them any flag that is raised before the emergence of the non-existent Mahdī whom they call the 'awaited' is a flag of ignorance.² They also dub all the Khulafā' besides 'Alī and Ḥasan رضي الله عنهما as disbelievers.

It should also be remembered that merely knowing the Imāms is not sufficient to obtain the rank of honour, because a person will not attain honour if he merely knows the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ and does not follow his instructions and obey his commands.³

3. The view of Irjā'

According to the Shī'ah, īmān is in essence acknowledging the Twelve Imāms. They take it the an extent further by confirming that merely knowing the Imāms is sufficient for the validity of one's faith and for admission in to Jannah; thereby adopting the stance of the Murji'ah.⁴ Therefore, the author of *al-Kāfī* has established a chapter titled, With īmān no evil is harmful and with disbelief no good is of benefit. Therein he presents six narrations; one among them is the following:

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/20.

2 Al-Nu'mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 7: chapter regarding a person who raises the flag before the appearance of the Mahdī being a devil.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/31.

4 Those who make a clear distinction between īmān and actions; who aver that īmān is purely the recognition of Allah ﷻ. Amongst them some say, "No one from the people of the Qiblah will enter hell-fire despite the countless sins that he has committed (*Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/213; *al-Milal wa al-Nihāl* 1/139; *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* p. 202-207; *al-Tanbīh wa al-Radd* p. 43; *al-Tabṣīr fī al-Dīn* p. 59; *al-Bad' wa al-Tārīkh* 5/144; *I'tiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn wa al-Mushrikīn* p. 107; *al-Khuṭaṭ* 2/350-439.

الإيمان لا يضر معه العمل و كذلك الكفر لا ينفع معه العمل

With īmān no action is harmful and with disbelief no action is beneficial.¹

And īmān according to them is love and veneration of the Imāms.

When Ibn Taymiyyah said, “Most of the Shīʿah believe that the love of ‘Alī is such a virtue that thereafter no evil is harmful.”² One of their scholars in contemporary times denied that saying the following:

ما نسبته إلي كثير من الشيعة من القول بأن حب علي حسنة ليس يضر معه سيئة فإنه بهتان منه فإنهم جميعا متفقون علي ذلك فتخصيصه الكثير منهم بهذه العقيدة ليس له وجه سوي الكذب.

What he has attributed to many of the Shīʿah regarding the love of ‘Alī being a virtue after which no evil is harmful is a slander. Because this is not just the belief of some rather it is the unanimous belief of all of them. So for him to only identify a few of them with this belief has no other possible interpretation besides that of a lie.³

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

وإذا كانت السيئات لا تضر مع حب علي فلا حاجة إلي الإمام المعصوم الذي هو لطف في التكليف فإنه إذا لم يوجد إنما توجد سيئات و معاصي فإذا كان حب علي كافيا فسواء وجد الإمام أو لم يوجد.

If evil sins are of no harm with the presence of the love of ‘Alī then there exists no need for an infallible Imām who is a bounty in terms of a divine code of conduct. Because, if the Imām is non-existent there will obviously only be evil and vice, so if the love of ‘Alī is sufficient then the existence/non-existence of the Imām does not make much of a difference.⁴

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/463.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/31.

3 Muḥammad Maḥdī al-Kāẓimī: *Minhāj al-Sharīʿah fī al-Radd ‘alā Ibn Taymiyyah* 1/98.

4 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/31.

Hence, the issue of the leadership of an infallible which is based upon him being a bounty for the creation falls apart because of the issue of mere love for him. As a general rule, every view of theirs contradicts and violates another. And this is the nature of any creed which does not originate from Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.

The only way in which the Shī'ah are different from the Murji'ah is that the latter asserts that īmān is the recognition of Allah whereas the former says that it is the recognition of the Imāms.

Their narrations can be found in abundance in this regard. One of their narrations assert:

وهل الدين إلا الحب

And is religion anything else but love?¹

Al-Majlisī has established a chapter named, Chapter: Regarding the reward of loving them and supporting them, and that they are a protection from hell.² Another chapter is named as follows, Alliance with 'Alī is a means of protection from the punishment of the All Powerful, and that if the people would all have united to love him, Allah would not have created the Fire.³ Likewise one of their narrations state:

لا يدخل الجنة أحد إلا من أحبه من الأولين والآخرين ولا يدخل النار أحد إلا من أبغضه من الأولين والآخرين

No person will enter Jannah besides the one who loves him from the first to come till the last to come. And no person will enter Jahannam besides the one who hates him from the first to come till the last to come.⁴

1 *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī*: 1/167; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/95.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 21/73-144.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 39/32.

4 *'Ilal al-Sharā'i* p. 162.

Based on this narration, the very bases of īmān on Allah, His Rasūl ﷺ, the religious doctrines, and all the Sharʿī obligations and duties is discarded. Nothing but the love of ‘Alī remains. This type of fabrications has led many people astray, who have a passion for liberty and fulfilling their carnal desires.¹

These narrations necessitate that the Qur’ān did not descend for the guidance of mankind but for their deviation, because no mention is made therein of loving ‘Alī or hating him whereas that is the principle on which a person will enter Jannah or Jahannam.

Al-Suwaidī says:

وإذا كان حب الله ورسوله غير كاف في النجاة والخلاص من العذاب بلا إيمان وعمل صالح فكيف يكون حب علي كافيا وهذا مخالف لقوله سبحانه: مَنْ يَعْمَلْ سُوءًا يُجْزَ بِهِ وَقَوْلُهُ: وَمَنْ يَعْمَلْ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ شَرًّا يَرَهُ بل مخالف لأصولهم ورواياتهم، أما المخالفة للأصول، فإنه إذا ارتكب رافضي الكبائر ولم يعاقبه الله علي ذلك يلزم ترك الواجب علي الله تعالى عندهم. وأما المخالفة للروايات فلأن عليا والسجاد الأئمة الآخرين قد روي عنهم في أدعيتهم الواردة عندهم بطرق صحيحة البكاء والاستعاذة من عذاب الله تعالى. وإذا كان مثل هؤلاء الكرام خاشعين خائفين من عذاب الله فكيف يصح لغيرهم أن يغتر بمحبتهم ويتكل عليهم في ترك العمل.

If mere love for Allah and His Rasūl ﷺ, without īmān and good actions, is not sufficient for salvation and emancipation from the punishment, then how can love for ‘Alī be sufficient? This is against the verse of the Qur’ān, Whoever does evil will be punished for it,² and the verse, Whoever does an iota of evil will see it.³ In fact it violates their principles and traditions as well. As for violating their principles, if a Shīʿī commits major sins and is not taken to task by Allah it amounts to Allah discarding an obligation according to them. And as for its violation of their tradition, it is reported through authentic chains of transmission that ‘Alī, al-Sajjād, and the Imāms would—in their authentically proven supplications to Allah—cry and seek his refuge from his punishment; hence, if they were so humbled and

1 Naqd ‘Aqā’id al-Shīʿah p. 34 (manuscript).

2 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 123.

3 Sūrah al-Zalzalah: 8.

fearful of the punishment of Allah then how would it ever be permissible for anyone else to be deceived by their love and depend solely upon it for salvation without doing any action.¹

Likewise, look at their claim that no one will enter hell besides a person who hated him from the first to come to the last to come. You will realise that this clearly indicates that the likes of Fir‘awn, Hāmān, Qārūn, and all the Lords of disbelief will not enter hell because they did not hate ‘Alī عليه السلام, rather they did not know him. See to what extent has their extremism driven them. There is no doubt that in refuting this claim not much effort is required due to its falsity being clearly evident in Islam. If the reality was really as they state it to be, Messengers would not have been sent, Books would not have been revealed, and divine legislation not implemented.

Sadly, however, the remnants of these beliefs still have their mark in the Shī‘ah world which has led them to undermining the Sharī‘ah of Allah and has made them bold against His commandments.

4. Their view with regards to the promises of Allah

Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī states:

إعتقادنا في الوعد أن من وعد الله علي عمل ثوابا فهو منجزه

Our belief is that whatever promise Allah has made upon any action He is bound to fulfilling it.²

They have went to great lengths in defining the promises of Allah; they have thus fabricated narrations and reports which they have ascribed to Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq and others. These narrations establish rewards for deeds regarding which Allah سبحانه وتعالى has not revealed any evidence. Instead, evidence suggests the improbability, prohibition, or even consideration of such deeds to polytheistic or

1 Naqd ‘Aqā’id al-Shī‘ah p. 34, 35.

2 Al-I‘tiqādāt p. 94; Awā’il al-Maqālāt p. 57; al-Majlisī: Al-I‘tiqādāt p. 100.

heretic in their nature, such as: cursing the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ of the Rasūl صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, which they have deemed the best act of worship,¹ slapping the cheeks, tearing the garments, inflicting pain upon one's self, and wounding oneself with knives and swords in the name of the commemoration of the martyrdom of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, which again, according to them, is the greatest of all devotions.² Likewise, performing the pilgrimage to the tombs of the Imāms, circummambulating around them, supplicating to them, and seeking help from them is also considered a very meritorious act of devotion according to them.³ And in this way do they concoct acts of devotion sanctioning that regarding which Allah سُبحانه وتعالى has not revealed any proof and attaching to them tremendous rewards.⁴

In addition, some of their narrations go on to mention that their Imāms have the prerogative of entering their Shī'ah into Jannah. In fact, they actually testified for some of their partisans specifically that they will enter Jannah. So they can promise reward and they can make that reward materialise.

A narration of this nature appears in *Rijāl al-Kashshī*. It reads as follows:

أَنَّ أَبَا الْحَسَنِ قَدْ ضَمِنَ لَهُ الْجَنَّةَ

Ziyād al-Qandī narrates from 'Alī ibn Yaqtīn that the Imām Abū al-Ḥasan gave him glad-tidings of Jannah.⁵

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 27/218.

2 Al-Zanjānī: 'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah 1/289; Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā': *al-Āyāt al-Bayyināt* p. 4; *Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-Shī'iyah* 21/706.

3 Refer to the discussion regarding their belief regarding the oneness of Allah سُبحانه وتعالى.

4 *Bihār al-Anwār*, chapter regarding the deeds of the day and night of Ghadīr and the supplications to be made therein 98/298-323, chapter regarding the actions of the day of Nowruz and whatever is linked to it 98/419; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah*, chapter regarding the desirability of fasting on the day of Nowruz, bathing therein, and wearing fine clothing and perfume 7/346, chapter regarding the desirability of fasting on the twenty ninth of Dhī al-Qa'dah and that it is an expiation for the sins of seventy years 7/333, likewise the chapters regarding the ṣalāh of Ja'far 5/194, 197, the ṣalāh of Fāṭimah 5/243, the ṣalāh of the day of Mubālahah which is equal to a hundred thousand Ḥajjs as they allege 5/287.

5 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 430.

Another narration states:

عن عبد الرحمان الحجاج قال: قلت لابي الحسن رضي الله عنه إن علي بن يقطين أرسلني إليك برسالة أسألك الدعاء له، فقال: في أمر الآخرة؟ قلت نعم، قالك فوضع يده علي صدره ثم قال: ضمنت لعلي بن يقطين ألا تمسه النار

‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Ḥajjāj says that he said to Abū al-Ḥasan that ‘Alī ibn Yaqtīn sent me with a letter to him asking him to supplicate on his behalf.

He asked, “Regarding the affairs of the afterlife?”¹

To which I responded by saying yes.

He placed his hand on his chest and said thus, “I take responsibility that the fire will not touch ‘Alī ibn Yaqtīn.”²

Look at how they make covenants on behalf of Allah as if they have the treasures of the Mercy of Allah and in their hands are the keys to everything; hence, they can guarantee without even leaving the matter pending upon the decision of Allah, they can distribute the certificates of forgiveness and mercy. Do they have a plan in place with Allah? Or did any Messenger bring down revelation to them? Or were they able to acquire the knowledge of the unseen? Or do they have an agreement with Allah?

Claims of this sort clearly pronounce that their fabricators are a group of heretics who do not believe in the Qur’ān and the Sunnah, and whose only purpose is to destroy Islam. They found no better ploy to carry out this agenda of theirs besides that of partisanship of the Ahl al-Bayt. ‘Alī ibn Yaqtīn for whom these heretics guaranteed Jannah probably is a member of their team, for Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī has mentioned that he was killed in 169 A.H upon his heretic beliefs.³

1 Note that the Imām had to ask what the objective of the supplication was, whereas the narration suggests that he knew the abode of the seeker and took responsibility for him. This is a fabrication of dim-witted people. Or maybe it is just that Allah ﷻ wanted to expose the disgrace of their creed by way of such widespread contradiction which is found in their narrations.

2 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 431 (he has cited quite a few narrations of the same nature on p. 431-433.

3 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 8/190.

Lastly, there are multiple narrations in the books of the Twelvers wherein the Imāms guarantee their followers admission into Jannah.¹

5. Their view regarding the warnings of Allah

Al-Mufīd says:

اتفقت الإمامية علي انالوعيد بالخلود في النار متوجه إلي الكفار خاصة دون مرتكبي الذنوب من أهل المعرفة بالله تعالي والإقرار بفرائضه من أهل الصلاة، وأنهم بارتكاب الكبيرة لا يخرجون عن الإسلام وإن كانوا يفسقون بما فعلوه من الكبائر والآثام.

The Imāmiyyah are unanimous that the warning of remaining forever in the Fire of Jahannam is directed to the disbelievers specifically. The sinful among those who have obtained the recognition of Allah and acknowledged his commandments by carrying out their ṣalāh are not included. And they by their commission of major sins do not leave the fold of Islam even though they will be considered sinful because of their sins.²

This statement outwardly is in accordance with the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah. They have however, failed in the implementation of this rule due their very broad definition of disbelief and things that render a person a disbeliever, such as the following:

اتفقت الإمامية علي أن صاحب البدع كلهم كفار، وأن علي الإمام أن يستتيبهم عند التمكن بعد الدعوة لهم وإقامة البيئات عليهم. فإن تابوا عن بدعهم وصاروا إلي الصواب وإلا قتلهم لردتهم عن الإيمان، وإن مات منهم علي تلك البدعة فهو من أهل النار.

The Twelvers are unanimous that people aligned to innovated creeds are disbelievers, and that it is the duty of the Imām to compel them to repent after engaging with them and establishing evidence. If they repent from

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/474,475; *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 447-448, 484; *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* p. 98, 185. In all these references mention is made of the Imāms guaranteeing their partisans entry into Jannah; this is considered to be an authentication of that narrator by the Shīʿī scholarship and thus they cite the narrations of such individuals in their books.

2 *Awa'il al-maqa'lāt* p. 14.

their innovations and move to the right path, well and good, or else they will be killed owing to their disbelief. And if any of them die upon his innovative beliefs he will be from the people of Jahannam.¹

Likewise they have unanimously dubbed as a disbeliever any person who opposed ‘Alī عليه السلام. Likewise, all such people are disbelievers, they are astray and accursed due to their opposition of Amīr al-Mu’minīn. And hence they will be doomed forever in the fire of Jahannam.² This is the blanket ruling they pass regarding anyone who opposes them; therefore, Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī has said:

واعتقادنا في من خالفنا في شيء واحد كاعتقادنا في من خالفنا في جميع أمور الدين.

Our stance regarding a person who has opposed us in one aspect of the categorically established aspects of dīn is that he is equal to the one who has opposed us in all aspects of dīn.³

So they are in terms of this *Wa’ḍiyyah* (extremists in sounding warnings). Hence, Ibn Taymiyyah has asserted that the later Shī’ah are *Wa’ḍiyyah* in the names of Allah and his commandments.⁴

Al-Ash‘arī goes onto mention that a group of the Shī’ah have the following approach:

يثبتون الوعيد علي من خالفهم ويقولون إنهم يعذبون ولا يقولون بإثبات الوعيد في من قال بقولهم، ويزعمون أن الله سبحانه يدخلهم الجنة، وإن أدخلهم النار أخرجهم منها. ورووا في أئمتهم أن ما كان بين الله وبين الشيعة من المعاصي سألوا الله فيهم فصفح عنهم، وما كان بين الشيعة وبين الأئمة تجاوزا عنه، وما كان بين الشيعة وبين الناس من المظالم شفّعوا لهم إليهم حتي يصفحوا عنهم.

They only establish the warnings against those who oppose them saying that they will be punished, etc., but they do not establish them against those who are in harmony with them. Rather they aver that Allah will

1 Ibid.

2 Ibid.

3 *Al-I’tiqādāt* p. 116; *al-Majlisī: Al-I’tiqādāt* p. 100.

4 *Al-Fatāwā* 6/55.

enter them into Jannah, and if he admits them into Jahannam he will take them out. They have narrated about the Imāms that they will intercede to Allah regarding the sins that the Shī'ah have committed subsequent to which Allah will forgive them. And the sins the Shī'ah committed against the Imāms will be forgiven. Regarding the sins they committed against the people the Imāms will intercede on their behalf to the implicated people who will consequently forgive them.¹

The exact same is conveyed by al-Majlisī in his book. A chapter therein reads as follows, Chapter: Regarding the forgiveness of the Shī'ah; therein he has cited ninety seven narrations and after citing them, it seems as if he considered them to be meagre so he reminds the readers that many more narrations of the same category have passed in the chapters of *Ma'ād* (afterlife), the pond of Nabī ﷺ, intercession, the state of the believers and criminals in the afterlife, and the chapters pertaining to the virtues of the Imāms.² The first narration that he cites in this chapter asserts the assessment of al-Ash'arī. It reads as follows:

إذا كان يوم القيامة ولينا حساب شيعتنا، فمن كانت مظلمته فيما بينه وبين الله عز وجل حكمتنا فيها فأجابنا، ومن كانت مظلمته فيما بينه وبين الناس استوهبناها فوهبت لنا، ومن كانت مظلمته فيما بينه وبيننا كنا أحق من عفا وصفح.

On the day of Judgment we will take charge of the accounting of our Shī'ah. Hence, whoever is responsible of a crime between him and Allah we will decide regarding it and He will approve. And whoever is responsible of a crime between him and the people we will seek it as a gift from them which we will consequently be granted. And if someone is responsible of a crime between him and us then we are more rightful to forgive.³

In conclusion, they are Wa'idiyyah (extremist in sounding warnings) when it comes to those who oppose them and Murji'ah when it comes to those who agree with them.

1 *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/126.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 68/99; 'Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā 2/68.

3 Ibid 68/99; 'Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā 2/68.

Discussion Two

Their belief regarding the fundamentals of īmān

The fundamentals of īmān comprise of the following: belief in Allah, His angels, His books, His Messengers, the Day of Judgement, and *Taqdīr* (pre-destiny) as is mentioned in the verse:

لَيْسَ الْبِرَّ أَنْ تُوَلُّوا وُجُوهَكُمْ قِبَلَ الْمَشْرِقِ وَالْمَغْرِبِ وَلَكِنَّ الْبِرَّ مَنْ آمَنَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ
وَالْمَلَائِكَةِ وَالْكِتَابِ وَالنَّبِيِّينَ

Piety is not that you turn your faces to the east and the west, rather piety is (the piety of the one) who believes in Allah, the Last day, the Angels, the Book, and the Messengers.¹

Likewise the verse:

إِنَّا كُلَّ شَيْءٍ خَلَقْنَاهُ بِقَدَرٍ

Verily we have created everything with a specific measure.²

The discussion regarding how the Shī'ah have deviated in their beliefs regarding Allah ﷻ, His status as a Nourisher and Lord of the universe, as well as His names and attributes has been discussed previously.

We will now discuss their beliefs regarding the other fundamentals of īmān, since the doctrine of Imāmah has impacted them as well. So despite them believing in the fundamentals of īmān, i.e. having faith in Allah, His angels, His books, His Messengers, *Taqdīr*, and the Day of Judgement; the doctrine of Imāmah has left its clear mark on them. This will be highlighted in the pages to come.

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 177

2 Sūrah al-Qamar: 49.

Īmān in the angels

This belief has received a good share of distortion in their creed. The angels have been created from light and they are the servants of the A'imma according to them; some amongst them appointed specifically to stand at the grave of Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه.

Their narrations state:

خلق الله من نور وجه علي بن أبي طالب سبعين ألف ملك يستغفرون له ولمحببيه إلي يوم القيامة

Allah created seventy thousand angels from the radiance of the face of 'Alī, who continuously seek forgiveness for him and for his admirers.¹

Sometimes they claim that Allah created the angels from the light of 'Alī.²

Likewise, they allege that amongst the angels there are some who have not been assigned for anything other than crying at the grave of Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه and repeatedly visiting him. They say:

و كل الله بقبر الحسين أربعة ألف ملك شعث غبر يبكونه إلي يوم القيامة

Allah has assigned four thousand dishevelled and dusty angels at the grave of Ḥusayn who will mourn his death till the Day of Judgment.³

And visiting the grave of Ḥusayn is the desire of the dwellers of the heavens. They assert:

و ليس شيء في السماوات إلا و هم يسألون الله ان يؤذن لهم في زيارة الحسين ففوج ينزل وفوج يعرج

There is nothing in the heavens but that it seeks the permission of Allah to visit the grave of Ḥusayn. Hence, scores go and scores come.⁴

1 *Kanz Jāmi' al-Fawā'id* p. 334; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 23/320.

2 *Al-Ma'lim al-Zulfā* p. 249.

3 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 10/318; *Furū' al-Kāfi* 1/325; *Thawāb al-A'māl* p. 49; *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* p. 189.

4 *Al-Ṭūsī: Al-Tahdhīb* 2/16; *Thawāb al-A'māl* p.54; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 10/322.

Similarly, they also say:

إن الملائكة لخدامنا وخدام محبيننا

The angels are our attendants and the attendants of those who love us.¹

In another lengthy narration it appears that Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام supplicated to Allah to make him the servant of the Imāms. Hence, they say, “Jibrīl is our attendant.”²

Ibn Taymiyyah whilst refuting Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī for citing such names which the Shī‘ah accord to the angels states:

فتسمية جبريل رسول الله إلي محمد صلي الله عليه وسلم خادما عبارة من لا يعرف قدر الملائكة و قدر إرسال الله لهم إلي الأنبياء

To name Jibrīl—the messenger of Allah sent to Muḥammad ﷺ—an attendant is an indication of one not knowing the status of the angels and the privilege of Allah ﷻ sending them to the Ambiyā’...?³

How can this lowly title be accorded to the one whom Allah ﷻ has describes as:

ذِي قُوَّةٍ عِنْدَ ذِي الْعَرْشِ مَكِينٍ إِنَّهُ لَقَوْلُ رَسُولٍ كَرِيمٍ

Verily it is the word of a noble messenger, who is mighty and holds a lofty rank by the Owner of the Throne.⁴

They have many more claims of this nature. As if the angels have no other obligation or duty but to serve the Twelve Imāms; or as if they are the angels of the Imāms and not the angels of Allah.

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/335; Ibn Bābawayh: *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 148; ‘*Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā* 1/262; ‘*Ilal al-Sharā’i*’ p. 13.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/344-345; *Irshād al-Qulūb* p. 214; *Kanz Jāmi’ al-Fawā’id* p. 483.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/158.

4 *Sūrah al-Takwīr*: 19-20

Abū ‘Abd Allāh (al-Ṣādiq) states:

إن الملائكة لتنزل علينا في رحالنا و تنقلب علي فرشنا، و تحضر موائدنا، و تأتينا من كل نبات في زمانه ركب و يابس، و تقلب علينا اجنحتها، و تقلت أجنحتها علي صبياننا، و تمنع الدواب أن تصل إلينا، و تأتينا في كل وقت صلاة لتصلبها معنا، و ما من يوم يأتي علينا ولا ليل إلا و أخبار أهل الأرض عندنا و ما يحدث فيها، و ما من ملك يموت في الأرض و يقوم غيره إلا و تأتينا بخبره و كيف كانت سيرته في الدنيا.

The angels descend upon us in our travel canopies, they frequent our beds, and are present at our eating cloths. They come to us from every fresh and dry plant of the time, they spread their wings over us and our children, they prevent the animals from attacking us, and they come to us at the time of every ṣalāh to offer it with us. No day or night passes but that we have knowledge of the people of the earth and of the events to happen therein. Likewise, no king dies except that they come to us with the news of his death and with a briefing of his conduct whilst he was in the world.¹

They also allege that the pillows and the ornaments of their children are prepared from the wings of the angels. In fact the angels are in charge of babysitting their children. Abū ‘Abd Allāh says, “They are more compassionate to our children than we are to them.”²

Furthermore, according to the narrations of the Shī‘ah the angels were also obligated to believe in the Wilāyah of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. However, despite there being a punishment in place for those angels who refuse to believe in his Wilāyah (as they allege), none of them accepted besides the angels close to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى,³ to the extent that one of the angels was punished by breaking his wings due to his refusal to believe in the Wilāyah of Amīr al-Mu’minīn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. He only recovered when he rubbed himself against the cradle of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.⁴

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 26/356; *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* p. 27.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 26/354; *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* p. 26.

3 *Bihār al-Anwār* 26/340; *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* p. 20.

4 *Bihār al-Anwār* 26/341; *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* p. 20.

Similarly, the angels only obtained honour after accepting the Wilāyah of ‘Alī ¹ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

And the life of the angels depends upon the Imāms owing to the following reason:

ليس لهم طعام ولا شراب إلا الصلاة علي بن أبي طالب ومحبيه، والإستغفار لشيعة المذنبين

They have no food or drink besides sending salutations to ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and his lovers, and seeking forgiveness for his sinful partisans.²

Another narration states the following:

وكانت الملائكة لا تعرف تسييحها ولا تقديسا من قبل تسييحنا (يعني تسييح الأئمة) وتسييح شيعتنا.

The angels did not know any type of *Tasbiḥ* or glorification before they learnt how to glorify us (the Imāms) and our partisans.³

In addition, the angels take special care of the Shī‘ah specifically, hence when a Shī‘ī has a private moment with another Shī‘ī, the scribes of the deeds separate from them for that time addressing each other saying, “Come let us go away, for they are having a secret moment which Allah has kept concealed upon them.”⁴ Whereas Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

إِذْ يَتَلَقَّى الْمُتَلَقِّيَانِ عَنِ الْيَمِينِ وَعَنِ الشِّمَالِ قَعِيدٌ

When the two receivers receive whilst sitting on the right and the left.⁵

1 *Tafsīr al-Ḥasan al-‘Askarī* p. 153; *al-Iḥtijāj* p. 31; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/338.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/349.

3 Ibn Bābawayh: *Jāmi‘ al-Akhbār* p. 9; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/344.

4 *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 8/563-564.

5 *Sūrah Qāf*: 17-18

Likewise:

أَمْ يَحْسِبُونَ أَنَّا لَا نَسْمَعُ سِرَّهُمْ وَنَجْوَاهُمْ ۚ بَلَىٰ وَرُسُلْنَا لَدَيْهِمْ يَكْتُبُونَ

Or do they think that we do not hear their secrets and their stealthy meetings? Most certainly we do. And our scribes are with them writing.¹

Nevertheless, they make various claims wherein they disregard the close angels of Allah ﷻ and slander them by way of eerie exaggerations and weird assumptions which are tantamount to the denial of the angels all together. Because denying the duties assigned to them through which Allah ﷻ honoured them, ascribing the obligation of believing in the Wilāyah to them, and attributing the act of ascribing partners to Allah by asserting that the duty of some of the angels is merely to encircle the tomb of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ; all make it very easy for a person to deny the angels completely.

They have almost denied the angels due to them interpreting the names of the angels which appear in the Qur’ān with the Imāms or by averring that the duties of the angels are only to see to the Imāms. Hence, al-Majlisī has established a chapter named: Chapter regarding the Imāms being the following: *al-Ṣāffūn* (the ones who form rows), *al-Musabbihūn* (the glorifiers), the possessors of *al-Maqām al-Ma’lūm* (a fixed position), the bearers of the Throne of Allah, and the noble and good scribes.²

This is what they have to say regarding the angels, whereas Allah ﷻ says:

بَلْ عِبَادٌ مُّكْرَمُونَ لَا يَسْبِقُونَهُ بِالْقَوْلِ وَهُمْ بِأَمْرِهٖ يَعْمَلُونَ

Rather they are honourable servants. They do not speak before him and they duly carry out his orders.³

1 Sūrah al-Zukhruf: 80.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 24/87.

3 Sūrah al-Ambiyā’: 26-27

Likewise:

مَنْ كَانَ عَدُوًّا لِلَّهِ وَمَلَائِكَتِهِ وَرُسُلِهِ وَجِبْرِيلَ وَمِيكَالَ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ عَدُوٌّ لِلْكَافِرِينَ

Whoever is an enemy of Allah, His angels, His Messengers, Jibrīl, and Mikāl then Allah is the enemy of the disbelievers.¹

Īmān in the divine books

The Shī'ah have been majorly influenced in this regard due to their deviant beliefs regarding Imāmah and other aspects; hence they have brought faith upon books regarding which Allah ﷻ has made no mention; for they claim that Allah revealed books to the Imāms from the heavens just as he had previously revealed books upon the Ambiyā' عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام. Similarly, they also claim that the Imāms had possession of all the books that were revealed to the Ambiyā' in the past; they would read these books and extract rulings therefrom.

Now read this for yourself from the authoritative books of the Shī'ah.

1. Their belief that divine books descended upon the Imāms²

The authoritative and classical books of the Shī'ah contain such extraordinary claims and such grave assumptions that do not have any existence in the real world, nor is there any trace of it whatsoever, and pertaining to which there exists no shred of evidence.

These claims entail that there exists holy books which came down from the heavens as revelation from Allah the Almighty to the Imāms. At times the Shī'ah cite narrations which they claim were extracted from these books based upon which they establish their beliefs and principles.

1 Al-Baqarah: 98.

2 There are other books as well which they claim were preserved by their Imāms. Mention was made of these books in the chapter regarding their beliefs about the Sunnah. These books also share some sort of holiness, however, they do not share in the aspect of being revealed from the heavens.

From all of this it seems as if the founding fathers of *Tashayyu'*, in order to substantiate their fundamental doctrines, did not suffice upon all the claims that have passed in the previous pages with regards to the Book of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى etc. They feared that they would not be sufficient to fulfil the purpose, due to which their adherents would flee from them and their legacy would become redundant. As a result they will lose their wealth, status, and sanctity which they receive from the adherents in the name of *Khums* and the representation of the Hidden Imām. They, therefore, concocted all these claims so that they may succeed in fulfilling their goals and strike another blow against the Ummah and its pristine dīn.

These claims are not very much different from the claims of most false prophets who also claimed that divine books were revealed to them or that they received revelation.

It is very possible that the inception of this particular doctrine happened in the time of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, as a narration of Imām al-Bukhārī's *Ṣaḥīḥ* suggests: Abū Juḥayfah says:

قلت لعلي هل عندكم كتاب؟ قال لا إلا كتاب الله أو فهم أعطيه رجل مسلم أو ما في هذه الصحيفة. قال قلت فما في هذه الصحيفة قال العقل و الفكاك ألاسير ولا يقتل مسلم بكافر

I said to 'Alī, “Do you have any special book?”

He said, “No, only the Book of Allah, the understanding a Muslim man is bestowed with or that which is in this script.”

I enquired, “What is in the script?”

He said, “Rules pertaining to the paying of blood money, the releasing of a prisoner, and that a Muslim will not be killed in lieu of a Non-Muslim.”¹

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* 1/204.

Another version of the narration in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* goes as follows:

هل عندكم شيء من الوحي إلا ما في كتاب الله

Do you have any aspect of revelation besides that which is contained in the Book of Allah?¹ (This explains what is intended by the word ‘book’ in the previous narration).

Ibn Ḥajar states that the reason why Abū Juḥayfah posed this question to him was that a group of the Shīʿah were falsely claiming that the Ahl al-Bayt in general and ‘Alī in particular were exclusively given some aspects of dīn by the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ which others were not given. Similarly, ‘Alī رضي الله عنه is reported to have been asked the same question by Qays ibn ‘Abbād and Ashtar al-Nakhaṭī; their narration appears in *Sunan al-Nasāʾī*.²

Hence it is understood from here that the seed of this doctrine was planted at a very early period in history. As for who was responsible for it, the booklet *al-Irjāʾ* of Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥanafīyyah indicates that the *Sabaʾīyyīn* (followers of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’) were the ones who began propagating such heresies among the people. They would say to them:

هديننا لوهي ضل عنه الناس، وزعموا أن النبي الله كتم تسعة أعشار القرآن

We have been guided to a revelation which is not known to the people. They also claimed that Nabī ﷺ concealed nine tenths of the Qurʾān.³

Likewise, in the book *Aḥwāl al-Rijāl* it appears that ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ would claim that the Qurʾān is only one part of nine parts and that the knowledge of those parts is with ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.⁴

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* 1/167.

2 *Faṭḥ al-Bārī* 1/204.

3 *Risālah al-Irjāʾ* (which is incorporated in the *Kitāb al-Īmān* of Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-ʿAdnī) p. 249-250.

4 *Al-Jūzajānī: Aḥwāl al-Rijāl* p. 38.

Nonetheless, the claims of the Saba'iyyah indicate towards some treasured knowledge that 'Alī عليه السلام had. This suggests the origins of this doctrine. In time to come, it took different forms and shapes which all stem from the primary belief that the Ahl al-Bayt possessed knowledge which others did not; exactly what 'Alī عليه السلام had denied and rejected. That which stems from falsehood is false. Therefore, just as the primary claim is erroneous, so is that which stems from it.

Hereunder, with all honesty I present before you some excerpts of what I found in their books in this regard.

a. The Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah:

The books of the Shī'ah allege that a special *Muṣḥaf* (divine scroll) was revealed to Fāṭimah عليها السلام after the demise of the Rasūl صلى الله عليه وسلم. One of the narrations of *al-Kāfī* states the following:

إن الله تعالى لما قبض نبيه صلي الله عليه وآله دخل علي فاطمة عليها السلام من فاته من الحزن ما لا يعلمه إلا الله عز وجل فأرسل الله إليها ملكا يسلي غمها ويحدثها فشكت ذلك إلي أمير المؤمنين رضي الله عنه فقال: إذا أحسست بذلك، وسمعت الصوت قولني لي فأعلمته بذلك فجعل أير المؤمنين رضي الله عنه يكتب كل ما سمع حتي أثبت من ذلك مصحفا.. أما إنه ليس فيه شيء من الحلال والحرام ولكن فيه علم ما يكون

When Allah سبحانه وتعالى captured the soul of his Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم, only Allah knows what grief gripped Fāṭimah. Hence, Allah sent an angel to her in order to pacify her and console her.

She complained of this to Amīr al-Mu'minīn who said to her, "When you feel that (the presence of the angel) and you hear his voice let me know."

She thus informed him subsequent to which 'Alī started to document whatever he heard the angel saying which resulted in it evolving into a *Muṣḥaf*... Behold! There are no rulings of permissible and impermissible therein. However, in it is contained the knowledge of the future.¹

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/240; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/44; *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* p. 43.

So, this narration suggests that this Muṣḥaf was specifically for the consolation and condolence of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا after the demise of her father. It also tells us that the subject matter thereof is the knowledge of the future. I am not quite sure how that would console her if the future of which she was being informed entailed the killing of her sons and grandsons, and of the miseries which befell the Ahl al-Bayt.

Similarly, how is it possible that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا be accorded knowledge of the unseen when the Messenger of guidance were ordered by Allah to say the following?

وَلَوْ كُنْتُ أَغْلَمُ الْغَيْبَ لَأَسْتَكْثَرْتُ مِنَ الْخَيْرِ

And if I knew the unseen, I could have acquired much wealth.

So is she more superior to the Rasūl of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ?

This narration also asserts that ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was the one who documented whatever the angel had dictated. But at the same time some of their other narrations suggests that he was engrossed in compiling the Qur’ān.¹ Naturally, lies are meant to contradict and oppose one another.

They also claim that this Muṣḥaf was triple the size of the Qur’ān. The following narration appears in *al-Kāfī*:

عن أبي بصير قال: دخلت علي أبي عبد الله- ثم ذكر حديثا طويلا في ذكر العلم الذي أودعه الرسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عند أئمة الشيعة- كما يزعمون- وفيه قول أبي عبد الله: (وإن عندنا لمصحف فاطمة عليها السلام) قلت (القول للراوي) وما مصحف فاطمة؟ عليها السلام قال: مصحف فيه مثل قرآنكم هذا ثلاث مرات ما فيه من قرآنكم حرف واحد

Abū Baṣīr says that he went to visit Abū ‘Abd Allāh (thereafter he narrates a lengthy narration which talks of the exclusive knowledge Allah had given

¹ Refer to pg. 310 of this book.

the Imāms wherein Abū ‘Abd Allāh says the following) “And we possess the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah عليها السلام.” The narrator says that he asked, “What is the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah?” He replied, “A Muṣḥaf wherein there is thrice the amount of what is in your Qur’ān but it does not have a letter that appears in your Qur’ān.”¹

This narration which their *Thiqat al-Islām*² narrates and which is authenticated by their scholars³ posits that their Muṣḥaf is more voluminous than the Qur’ān in its size and it differs in its subject matter from it. Does this mean that the Qur’ān is inferior to the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah and that her Muṣḥaf is more comprehensive than the Book of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى regarding which Allah has said?

بَيِّنَاتٍ لِّكُلِّ شَيْءٍ وَهُدًى وَرَحْمَةً وَبُشْرَىٰ لِلْمُسْلِمِينَ

A clarification for all things and as guidance and mercy and good tidings for the Muslims.⁴

And which Allah has ordained to be the constitution and way of life to be followed for the Ummah till the Day of Judgement? Is the Ummah in need of another book besides the Book of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى in order to complete dīn? And will dīn be considered incomplete if it is deprived of the Muṣḥaf whereas the entire Ummah unanimously agrees today of the non-existence of such a Muṣḥaf? Furthermore, how can a book of consolation and condolence surpass the Qur’ān in its comprehensiveness? Is this not the limit of absurdity and boldness to invent lies?

Nonetheless, their narrations differ very much in the description of the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah عليها السلام, as is the nature of all lies. The above mentioned narration

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/239.

2 The title they award to Abū Ja’far al-Kulaynī which literally means an authentic transmitter of the Muslim world.

3 *Al-Shāfi Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 3/197.

4 *Sūrah al-Naḥl*: 89.

suggests that it was the dictation of one of the angels and that it was revealed to her after the demise of the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ. But another narration states the following:

وخلفت فاطمة عليها السلام ما هو القرآن، ولكنه كلام من كلام الله أنزله عليها إملاء رسول الله وخط علي

And Fāṭimah left behind that which is not Qur'ān, but it is the Word of Allah which He revealed to her with the dictation of the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ and the documentation of 'Alī.¹

Hence, this narration suggests that her Muṣḥaf was existent in the time of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and the dictator was Rasūl Allah ﷺ and the word was the word of Allah.

The latter part of this narration contradicts the former. For how is it possible that it descended upon her but it was dictated by the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ and documented by 'Alī رضي الله عنه.

Another narration suggests:

مصحف فاطمة عليها السلام ما فيه شيء من كتاب الله وإنما هو شيء القى عليها

The Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah does not contain anything of that which is in the Book of Allah. It is something with which she was divinely inspired.²

This narration conversely suggests that she was divinely inspired with the Muṣḥaf; there was no dictation from the Rasūl ﷺ nor any documentation on the part of 'Alī رضي الله عنه, nor did any angel come to her and console her so that 'Alī رضي الله عنه may write his consolation; nothing of this sort happened. Based on this narration, it was just what she was inspired with after the demise of her father, not during his lifetime.

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 26/42; *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* p. 42.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 26/48; *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* p. 42.

Furthermore, the Imāms (as the books of the Shī'ah allege) would use the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah as a medium to procure the knowledge of the unseen and of events to transpire in the future; Abū 'Abd Allāh says:

تظهر الزنادقة في سنة ثمان و عشرين و مائة و ذلك أني نظرت في مصحف فاطمة عليها السلام

Heretics will emerge in 128 A.H. This is because I referred to the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah ¹ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام.

Meaning: I inferred this from there. When analysing the history of this particular year which is stipulated in this tale there are no major events that happened (as is apparent from the books of history) besides the killing of a few spearheads of some heterodox movements like Jahm ibn Ṣafwān and others; this obviously proves the very opposite of what the tale claims. Another narration says:

إني نظرت في مصحف فاطمة عليها السلام قبيل فلم أجد في لبني فلان فيها إلا كغبار النعل

I had a look at the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah a while ago. I did not find the share of *Banū Fulān* (a specific family or tribe) in that (referring to something specific) but as little as the dust of a shoe.²

This tale is tainted with a little bit of *Taqiyyah* (dissimulation); because he did not specify who is *Banū Fulān* (the tribe), nor did he specify what the pronoun 'hā' refers to. Al-Majlisī, as is his wont, did not clarify these two aspects as well. Possibly, the children of Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib are meant by *Banū Fulān* and *Khilāfah* (rulership) is meant by the pronoun 'hā'. For the simple reason that the Shī'ah have much to say about his family, e.g. they claim that jealousy and love for the material world persuades them to reject (the leadership of the children of Ḥusayn).³

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/240.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 26/48; *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* p. 44

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/305-306.

Nonetheless, the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah is a medium by way of which they endeavour to discover the events of the world. If this was really true then history would have been something else altogether. And the Imāms would not have suffered such trial and afflictions which the books of the Shī'ah sketch, nor would the awaited Mahdī hide away and disappear into occultation owing to the fear of getting killed, nor would there be the slightest need for Taqiyyah; for ostensibly they would save themselves from all sorts of afflictions by procuring prior knowledge of their occurrence and they would obtain all desirable conditions by procuring the knowledge of the means thereof. If they claim that they do not have the prerogative to change anything therefrom then they are just like the rest of the people who are bound by the *Qadr* (pre-destiny) of Allah and the knowledge of those future events would serve no purpose but the provocation of their grief.

The content of the aforementioned narrations was that the subject matter of the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah (عليها السلام) is the knowledge of the future. However, another narration which is reported by al-Kulaynī states that Abū 'Abd Allāh said the following with regards to it:

ما أزعَمُ أن فيه قرآنًا وفيه ما يحتاج الناس إلينا ولا نحتاج إلي أحد حتي فيه الجلدة و نصف الجلدة و ربع
الجلدة و ارش الخدش

I do not assume that therein there is anything of the Qur'ān; therein is contained those aspects in which people will need us and we will not need anyone. To the extent that it contains the rulings of a lash, half a lash, quarter of a lash and the penalty for a scratch.¹

This narration asserts that the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah, in addition to having mention of the future events, also contains the knowledge of Islamic penal law, to the extent that it also describes the penalty for a scratch. Instead it contains knowledge of the entire Sharī'ah which has made the Imāms independent of everyone else. Does this mean that they are not in need of the Book of Allah, or that they can

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/240.

dispense with the Qur'ān and replace it with the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah? As a result, they will have another law and the Muslim community will have another?

And does it imply that the great Islamic constitution did not reach its culmination via the Qur'ān and the Sunnah, and therefore it had to be completed with the aid of the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah عليها السلام, or does her Muṣḥaf suffice on behalf of all of them?

The purport of these narrations is unequivocal. Bestowing the Imāms with the knowledge of the unseen is conferring upon them one of the exclusive attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, i.e. the knowledge of the unseen. And considering the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah to be comprehensive of the penal and compensatory law of Islam is subtly levelling an allegation against the Sharī'ah in terms of it being incomplete.

In addition, they have another narration that states that the knowledge of the Sharī'ah is contained in the *Jāmi'ah* and not in the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah; they say:

إن عندنا لصحيفة يقال له الجامعة ما من حلال ولا حرام إلا وهو فيها حتي أرشن الخدش

We are in possession of a script which is known as the *Jāmi'ah*, there is no permissible or impermissible act but that it is contained therein, even the compensation of a scratch.¹

Likewise they have another script which is known as the script of penal law. In there the punishment of even a third of a lash is mentioned:

ثلث جلدة من تعدي ذلك كان عليه حد جلدة

One third of a lash, whoever exceeds it will receive the punishment of one lash.²

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/23 with reference to *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* p. 390.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/19-20 with reference to *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* p. 38.

As for the knowledge of the future, they believe that the source of it is not the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah. Rather it is contained in the skin of a big lamb which in its size is bigger than Jibrīl and Mikā'īl. They say:

ما ينقلب طائر في الهواء إلا وعندنا فيه علم

No bird turns in the skies but that we have knowledge regarding it.¹

After all of this, they still then claim that all knowledge is derived from the Qur'ān, the Book of Allah ﷻ. Abū 'Abd Allāh says:

إني أعلم ما في السماوات وما في الأرض، وأعلم ما في الجنة، وأعلم ما في النار وأعلم ما كان وما يكون. قال (الراوي): ثم مكث هنيهة فرأى أن ذلك كبر علي من سمعه منه فقال: (علمت ذلك من كتاب الله عز وجل، إن الله عز وجل يقول فيه تبيان كل شيء

I know what is in the heavens, what is in the earth, what is in Jannah, what is in Hellfire, and I have knowledge of what transpired in the past and what is to happen in the future. (The narrator says) then he paused for a while and realised that the congregation was finding it difficult to accept this claim so he said, "I obtained the knowledge of this from the Book of Allah; verily Allah ﷻ says regarding the Qur'ān that it has clarity with regards to everything."²

Similarly, it was mentioned previously that some contemporary Shī' scholars believe that the Qur'ān is free from distortion because it was compared with the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah (and found to be identical).³ But al-Khunayzī on the other hand states that the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah is very different from the Qur'ān and also avers that this is what their narrations confirm as well;⁴ while other statements and narrations contradict this entirely. The Shī'ah are not even embarrassed by this contradiction because their dīn rests upon Taqīyah.

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 26/19; 'Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā p. 200.

2 The reference has passed. Refer to p. 165 of this book.

3 See p. 265 of this book

4 Al-KhunaYzī: *al-Da'wah al-Islāmiyyah* 1/47.

Furthermore, in the book *Dalā'il al-Nubuwwah* which is considered to be a reliable book according to them.¹ a narration appears which describes this particular Muṣḥaf in the following manner:

فيه خبر ما كان وما يكون إلى يوم القيامة، وفيه خير سماء سماء، وعدد ما في السماوات من الملائكة وغير ذلك، وعدد كل من خلق الله مرسلًا وغير مرسل، وأسماءهم، وأسماء من أرسل إليهم، وأسماء من كذب ومن أجاز، وأسماء جميع من خلق الله من المؤمنين والكافرين وصفة كل من كذب، وصفة القرون الأولى وقصصهم، ومن ولي من الطواغيت ومدة ملكهم وعددهم وأسماء الأئمة وصفتهم وما يملك كل واحد واحد....فيه أسماء جميع ما خلق الله وأجلهم، وصفة أهل الجنة وعدد من يدخلها، وعدد من يدخل النار، وأسماء هؤلاء وهؤلاء، وفيه علم القرآن كما أنزل، وعلم التوراة كما أنزل وعلم الإنجيل كما أنزل، وعلم الزبور، وعدد كل شجرة ومدرّة في جميع البلاد.

Therein is contained the knowledge of the past and the future till the Day of Judgement. In it is the knowledge of every heaven, of the amount of angels in every heaven, of the amount of humans Allah has created including the prophets and others, the knowledge of their names, the names of the people they were sent to, the names of those who accepted and those who rejected, the names of all those whom He created from the believers and the disbelievers, the description of all those who belied the prophets, the description of the previous nations and their stories, the information of all tyrant rulers, their period of rule and their exact count, the names of the Imāms, their descriptions, and what each one possessed... In it is contained the knowledge of everything that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has created—coupled with its lifespan, the description of the people of Jannah, their amount, and the amount of people who will enter Jahannam and the names of these people and those people. In it is the knowledge of the Qur'ān as it was revealed, the knowledge of the Tawrah as it was revealed, the knowledge of the Injil

1 Al-Majlisi has said the following regarding the book, “It is from the widespread reliable books. Many scholars who succeeded him benefited from it the likes of Ibn Ṭā'ūs and others. The author is a reliable transmitter of the Twelvers (his name is Muḥammad ibn Jarīr ibn Rustum al-Ṭabarī) he is not the Ibn Jarīr from the opposite side who has written a book on history.” (al-Majlisī: *Bihār al-Anwār* 1/39/40) The introduction to the book states the following, “This book has remained a reliable reference of the Shī'ah in the aspects of Imāmah and ḥadīth. A book which is an attraction and an authentic source from then till the present time. (introduction: p. 5)

as it was revealed and the knowledge of the Zabūr. Similarly the knowledge of the count of every tree and every pebble in every town.¹

It further states that all of this is contained in the first two pages of the Muṣḥaf.² The narrator also says that their Imāms have said:

و ما وصفت لك بعد ما في الورقة الثالثة ولا تكلمت بحرف منه

I have not even communicated to you as yet what is contained in the third page and onwards nor have I mentioned a word therefrom.³

We do not know what the size of this ‘page’ is, nor are we able to ascertain the reason for the Imāms not benefitting from this great knowledge in order to reclaim their right to leadership wherefrom they were deprived according to the Shīʿah.

Furthermore, why does not their awaited Mahdī emerge from his cave and why is he afraid of death (as the Shīʿah assert is his reason for going into occultation) if he has the wealth of this phenomenal knowledge?

The narration of *Dalā'il al-Nubuwwah*, furthermore, gives a different account of how the Muṣḥaf was revealed as opposed to the previous narration of *al-Kāfi* which states that ‘Alī عليه السلام documented the dictates of the angel which eventually took the form of a Muṣḥaf; the narration mentions:

إنه نزل جملة واحدة من السماء بواسطة ثلاثة من الملائكة وهم جبرائيل وإسرافيل وميكائيل...فهبطوا به وهي قائمة تصلي فما زالوا قياما حتي قعدت، و لما فرغت من صلاتها سلموا عليها و قالوا:السلام يقرئك السلام ووضعوا المصحف في حجرها. فقالت: لله السلام و منه السلام و إليه السلام و عليكم يا رسول الله السلام

1 *Dalā'il al-Nubuwwah* p. 27-28.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid.

It descended all at once with the agency of three angels: Jibrīl, Isrāfīl, and Mikā'īl. They came down with it whilst she was performing ṣalāh. Hence, they remained standing till she sat and completed her ṣalāh, thereafter, they greeted her and said, “Al-Salām (Allah) has conveyed his greetings to you.” Subsequently they placed the Muṣḥaf in her lap.¹ She responded, “Peace belongs to Allah, from him does it originate and to him does it return, and may his peace be upon you, O Messenger of Allah.”

The narration continues:

ثم عرجوا إلي السماء فما زالت من بعد صلاة الفجر إلي زوال الشمس تقرأه حتي أتت إلي آخره (و لقد كانت عليها السلام مفروضة الطاعة علي جميع من خلق الله من الجن و الإنس و الطير و الوحش و الأنبياء و الملائكة. قالت: جعلت فداك فلمن صار ذلك المصحف بعد مضيها؟ قال: دفعته إلي أمير المؤمنين، فلما مضى صار إلي الحسن ثم إلي الحسين ثم عند أهله حتي يدغوه إلي صاحب هذا الأمر ...

Thereafter they returned to the heavens and Fāṭimah continuously read the Muṣḥaf from after the Fajr ṣalāh up to the time of Zawāl (when the sun reaches its zenith) till she completed an entire reading. And Fāṭimah was such that loyalty to her was obligatory upon all the creations of Allah سُبْحَانَ رَبِّيَ i.e. jinn, mankind, birds, animals, the prophets and the angels. (The narrator says) I enquired, “May I be sacrificed for thee! Who inherited this Muṣḥaf from her after her demise?” “She passed it on to Amīr al-Mu'minīn. After him it went to Ḥasan, then to Ḥusayn, then to his family till it was passed on to the rightful claimant of this affair.”²

This is just a glimpse of what appears in their books with regards to the alleged Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah. It tells us that a Muṣḥaf was revealed to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا after the demise of the Rasūl of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ wherein was contained the knowledge of the unseen, the knowledge of the penal law of Islam and much more, and that today it rests with the hidden Imām! It is likewise a revelation just like the Qur'ān, just that it is three times more voluminous and does not contain even a letter of it. So did this Muṣḥaf come down in order to complete the Qur'ān?

1 *Dalā'il al-Nubuwwah* p. 27-28.

2 *Ibid.*

Nonetheless, there are many other books of this nature regarding which the Shī'ah have made very similar claims. This is a very vast topic and requires an exclusive treatise. Hence, omitting all the details I shall present the names of some of them coupled with a brief introduction to each one.

b. A book that was revealed to the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ before his demise:

Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام says:

إن الله عز وجل أنزل علي نبيه كتابا قبل أن يأتيه الموت فقال: يا محمد هذا الكتاب وصيتك إلي النجيب من أهل بيتك، فقال: و من النجيب من أهلي يا جبرائيل؟ فقال: علي بن أبي طالب عليه السلام، وكان علي الكتاب خواتيم من ذهب، فدفعه النبي صلي الله عليه وسلم و سلم و آله إلي علي عليه السلام و أمره أن يفك خاتما منها و يعمل بها فيه، ففك عليه السلام خاتما و عمل بها فيه، ثم دفعه إلي الحسين عليه السلام ففك خاتما فوجد فيه أن أخرج يقوم إلي الشهادة فلا شهادة لهم إلا معك و أشر نفسك لله عز وجل ففعل، ثم دفعه إلي علي بن الحسين عليه السلام ففك خاتما فوجد فيه اصمت و الزم منزلك و اعد ربك حتي يأتيك اليقين ففعل، ثم دفعه إلي محمد بن علي عليه السلام ففك خاتما فوجد فيه: حدث الناس و أفنتهم ولا تخافن إلا الله فإنه لا سبيل لأحد عليك، ثم دفعه إلي ففككت خاتما فوجدت فيه حدث الناس و أفنتهم و انشر علوم أهل بيتك، و صدق آباءك الصالحين ولا تخافن أحدا إلا الله و أنت في حرز و أمان ففعلت ثم ادفعه إلي موسى بن جعفر و كذلك يدفعه موسى إلي الذي من بعده ثم كذلك أبدا إلي قيام المهدي عليه السلام.

Allah ﷻ revealed a book upon his Nabī before death overtook him.

Hence he said, "O Muḥammad! This book is your bequest to the noble member of your household."

The Rasūl ﷺ enquired, "And who is the noble member of my household, O Jibrīl?"

He replied, "'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib."

The book comprised of letters that were sealed with gold seals which the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ handed over to 'Alī ibn Ṭālib instructing him to open one of them and practice upon its content. Hence, he opened one of them and practiced upon it, thereafter he handed it to Ḥasan who also opened one of them and practiced upon it.

Subsequently, he gave it to Ḥusayn who also opened one of them and found the following order: Advance towards martyrdom with a group of people for whom martyrdom is not destined but with you and hand yourself over to Allah ﷻ, hence that is what he did.

He handed it over to ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn who when opening one of the seals found the following order: Remain silent, stay in your house, and worship your Lord till death comes your way, hence, he did so.

He then handed it over to Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī. He also opened one of them and found thus: Educate the people, answer their queries, and do not fear anyone besides Allah for no one will have the upper hand over you.

He, thereafter, passed it on to me so I opened a seal and I found the following: Educate the people, answer their questions, propagate the knowledge of your household, affirm the mission of your pious forefathers, and do not fear any one besides Allah, for you are in his security and protection, thereafter I will pass it on to Mūsā ibn Ja‘far and he will pass it on to his successor. In this manner should this book be passed on till the emergence of the Mahdī.¹

What emanates from this report is that the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ did not know who was the noble member of his household till the very time of his demise, which is why he enquired about him. This implies that he had not made any official announcement to the people regarding his successor which makes all the narrations of Shī‘ah worthless and unacceptable. If it is said that there were many noble members within the Ahl al-Bayt and the enquiry was just for the stipulation of one of them, then too the claims of the Shī‘ah regarding the superiority of ‘Alī ﷺ hold no basis whatsoever.

Furthermore, the report does not give any details with regards to the orders that were given to ‘Alī and Ḥasan ﷺ and it mentions the order given to Ḥusayn, i.e.

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 36/192-193; *Ikṃāl al-Dīn* p. 376; *Amālī al-ṣadūq* p. 240; *Amālī al-Shaykh* p. 282; *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/280.

his quest for martyrdom. But this historically defies reality due to the fact that Ḥusayn عليه السلام did not anticipate martyrdom when he left, and also because those who were responsible for the dreadful consequences that Ḥusayn عليه السلام faced were the very people who incited him and beguiled him to come to them, and when he came to them they abandoned him and turned away from helping him despite claiming to be his partisans. They had written multiple letters to him inducing him to intend their lands and when he came close to their lands they turned their backs on him. Instead most of them joined the ranks of the enemies, either due to fear or due to hope, and became the cause of his martyrdom and the martyrdom of those who were with him.¹ It is for this reason that the books of the Shī'ah have labelled those who succeeded Ḥusayn عليه السلام after his demise as apostates with the exception of three people.² So is this report an endeavour to secure the position of these people (the Forsakers).

Then how do they differentiate between the Imāms in terms of the obligation of da'wah and the propagation of knowledge; among them are some who are required to remain at home whilst others are obligated to propagate knowledge and openly advance the cause of Islam. Another glaring aspect of this ḥadīth is that it concedes the fact that the Shī'ah did not have any transmitter of knowledge and propagator thereof till the advent of Abū Ja'far al-Ṣādiq. This is confirmed by another narration wherein it is stated:

كانت الشيعة قبل أن يكون أبو جعفر و هم لا يعرفون مناسك حجهم و حلالهم و حرامهم، حتي كان أبو جعفر يفتح لهم، و بين لهم مناسك حجهم و حلالهم و حرامهم.

Before the advent of Abū Ja'far the Shī'ah did not know the rites of Ḥajj and what was lawful or unlawful for them till he came and opened this chapter of knowledge to them and educated them regarding the rites of Ḥajj and the aspects of Ḥalāl and Ḥarām.³

1 *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* p. 62.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/380.

3 *Ibid* 2/20.

This implies that the Shī'ah before the advent of Abū Ja'far were worshipping Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى ignorantly.

Furthermore, did 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, implementing the order issued to him, remain at home and give preference to seclusion? Or did he violate it and go out to propagate knowledge and call towards Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى with wisdom and foresight? 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn is from among the senior successors of the Ṣaḥābah in terms of his knowledge and piety. He is the one who is reported to have said the following regarding these fabricators:

أحبونا حب الإسلام فوالله ما زال بنا ما تقولون حتي بغضتمونا إلي الناس

Love us in accordance with the teachings of Islam! For by Allah what you say is being continuously ascribed to us till it has reached a point where you have made the people despise us.¹

Al-Zuhrī says:

ما رأيت قرشياً أفضل منه و ما رأيت أفقه منه

I have not seen a Qurayshī more intelligent and more knowledgeable than him.²

He was a trustworthy and prolific narrator of ḥadīth.³

Shaykh al-Mufīd has acknowledged that he had propagated knowledge. He says:

وقد روي عنه فقهاء العامة- يعني أهل السنة-من العلوم ما لا يحصي كثرة، و حفظ عنه من المواعظ و الأدعية و الحلال و الحرام، و المغازي و الأيام ما هو مشهور بين العلماء و لو قصدنا إلي شرح ذلك لطلأ به الخطاب

1 Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa'd 5/214.

2 Al-Khazrajī: al-Khulāṣah p. 273.

3 Minhāj al-Sunnah 2/153.

The scholars of the commonality (the Ahl al-Sunnah) have narrated from him such knowledge that cannot be enumerated due to its copiousness. And many advices, supplications, permissible and impermissible issues, and the events from the time of Nabī ﷺ have been documented and preserved from which are very commonly known amongst the scholars. The discussion would become too long if we were to expound on them all.¹

This is how their narrations contradict each other and their statements oppose one another which is a sign of fabrication.

c. The Tablet of Fāṭimah:

This is different from the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah (as they allege), for the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah descended after the demise of the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ through the agency of an angel whose dictates ‘Alī رضي الله عنه documented, or it came down all at once through the medium of three angels, etc. As for the Tablet of Fāṭimah it has other features: it was revealed to the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ who subsequently gifted it to Fāṭimah, among others. They have extracted some texts from this tablet which support their beliefs. It seems that the information regarding the Tablet of Fāṭimah has been kept very discreet from others. Hence it is a secret from their secrets. We do not know how the information about it leaked and when did it leak.

Here is a narration which the author of *Al-Wāfi* reports from *al-Kāfi* on the authority of Abū Baṣīr who narrates from Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ṣādiq:

قال أبي لجابر بن عبد الله الأنصاري: إن لي إليك حاجة متي يخف عليك أن أخلو بك فأسألك عنها؟ قال له جابر: في أي الأحوال أحببت فخلا به في بعض الأيام فقال له، يا جابر أخبرني عن اللوح الذي رأيته في يد أمي فاطمة بنت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وآله وما أخبرتك به أمي أنه في ذلك اللوح مكتوب، فقال جابر: أشهد بالله أنني دخلت علي أمك فاطمة عليها السلام في حياة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله فهنيتها بولادة الحسين فرأيت في يديها لوحاً أخضر ظننت أنه من زمرد ورأيت فيه كتاباً أبيض شبه لون الشمس فقلت لها، بأبي و أمي أنت يا بنت رسول الله ما هذا اللوح فقالت: هذا لوح أهداه الله تعالى إلي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله فيه إسم أبي وإسم علي وإسم ابني واسم الأوصياء من ولدي وأعطانيه أبي ليبشرني بذلك. قال جابر: فأعطتني أمك فاطمة عليها السلام فقرأته واستنسخته فقال أبي:

1 Al-Mufid: *Al-Irshād* p. 292-293; ‘Abbās al-Qummī: *al-Anwār al-Bahiyah* p. 112.

فهل لك يا جابر أن تعرضه علي؟ قال: نعم، فمشي معه أبي إلي منزل جابر فأخرج صحيفة من رق فقال: يا جابر انظر في كتابك لأقرأ عليك، فنظر جابر في نسخته وقرأ أبي، فما خالف حرف حرفاً، فقال جابر: أشهد بالله أنني هكذا رأيته في اللوح مكتوباً: بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم هذا كتاب من الله العزيز الحكيم لمحمد نبيه و نوره و سفيره و حجابيه و دليله نزل به الروح الأمين من عند رب العالمين عظم يا محمد أسمائي و اشكر نعمائي.

My father said to Jābir ibn ‘Abd Allāh, “I have a query. Please let me know whenever it is convenient for you or when it is possible for me to meet with you in privacy so that I may ask you. Jābir replied, “I am available at any time you want.”

Hence he met with him one of the days and asked him, “O Jābir! Tell me of the tablet that you saw in the hands of my mother, Fāṭimah, the daughter of the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ. And what did my mother tell you about the contents therein?”

Jābir said, “I testify by Allah that I went to visit your mother in the lifetime of the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ to congratulate her on the birth of Ḥusayn. There I saw a green tablet in her hand which I assumed was of emerald, and therein I saw a letter which in its radiance was like the sun. so I said to her, ‘May my parents be sacrificed for thee! O daughter of the Rasūl of Allah, what is this tablet?’ She replied, ‘This is a tablet which Allah sent to the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ. In it is contained my father’s name, the name of ‘Alī, the name of my son, and the names of his successors among my children. My father gifted it to me in order to break the good news to me.’ Your mother then gave me the tablet to have a look at it. I read it and was delighted by its content.”

My father then asked him, “Would it be possible for you, O Jābir, to let me have a look at it?”

He responded in the affirmative. He then accompanied Jābir to his house and took out a script of paper and said, “Look into your copy so that I may read to you from mine.”

Hence, Jābir read his copy whilst my father read his and there was not a letter’s difference in the two of them.

So Jābir said, “I testify by Allah that this is exactly how I found it written in the Tablet. It reads as follows:

In the name of Allah, the Most Compassionate, the Most Merciful. This is a letter from Allah, the Almighty, the All Wise, to Muḥammad, His Nabī, His light, His vicegerent, His veil, and His proof. Jibrīl, the trustworthy spirit, has come down with it from the Lord of the universe. O Muḥammad glorify my praises and show gratitude for my bounties...”¹

d. Their claim that twelve scripts descended from the heavens which comprised of the attributes and the features of the Imāms:

The following is an excerpt of a long narration which Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (al-Ṣadūq) narrates:

إن الله تبارك و تعالی نزل علي علي اثني عشر خاتما و اثني عشر صحيفة اسم كل إمام علي خاتمه و صفته
في صحيفته

Allah ﷻ revealed twelve rings to ‘Alī and twelve scripts. Each ring contains the name of one of the Imāms and each script has a description of one of them.²

They have many other claims in this regard.³

1 Refer to the following books: *al-Kāfī* 1/527-528; *al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī: Al-Wāfi* 2/72; *al-Ṭabarsī: al-Ihtijāj* 1/84-87; Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī: *Ikmal al-Dīn* p. 301-304; *al-Ṭabarsī* (the author of *Majma’ al-Bayān*): *A’lām al-Warā* p. 152; *al-Karājaki: al-Istīṣār* p. 18. Note: It should be remembered that the Shī‘ī narrators have not narrated this allegedly divine letter in an identical manner; e.g. compare the narration of *Ikmal al-Dīn* with the narration of *al-Kāfī*. **A picture will be given ahead.**

2 *Ikmal al-Dīn* p. 263.

3 There are other books other than the ones mentioned above, e.g. the script of Fāṭimah... which they claim is a white script made of a pearl wherein the names of the Imāms are mentioned. It is forbidden for the people to touch it as it appears in a narration, “It is forbidden to touch it but for a Nabī, his Waṣī (his appointed successor) or the household of a Nabī.” They have given snippets of this script. One reads as follows: “Abū al-Qāsim, Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allah al-Muṣṭafā, his mother is Āminah; Abū al-Ḥasan, ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib al-Murtaḍā, his mother is Fāṭimah bint Asad...” etc. See *Biḥār al-Anwār* 36/193-194; *Ikmal al-Dīn* p. 178; *Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā* p. 24, 25.

After the basis of the belief in the Imāms being shaken due to not having any evidence in the Qur'ān, the Shī'ah have in this manner endeavoured to establish it; they went onto claim that divine books descended with the Qur'ān. This claim of theirs can be added to the list of their fabrications and deceptions.

Analysing this doctrine

Allah سُبحانه وتعالى says:

يَسْأَلُكَ أَهْلُ الْكِتَابِ أَنْ تُنْزِلَ عَلَيْهِمْ كِتَابًا مِّنَ السَّمَاءِ فَقَدْ سَأَلُوا مُوسَىٰ أَكْبَرَ مِنْ ذَلِكَ فَقَالُوا أَرَنَا
اللَّهُ جَهْرَةً فَأَخَذَتْهُمُ الصَّاعِقَةُ بِظُلْمِهِمْ

The People of the Scripture ask you to bring down to them a book from the heaven. But they had asked of Mūsā [even] greater than that and said, “Show us Allah outright,” so the thunderbolt struck them for their wrongdoing.¹

And Allah سُبحانه وتعالى says:

وَقَالُوا لَن نُّؤْمِنَ لَكَ حَتَّىٰ تَفْجُرَ لَنَا مِنَ الْأَرْضِ يَبُوعًا أَوْ تُكُونَ لَكَ جَنَّةٌ مِّن نَّخِيلٍ وَعِنَبٍ فَتُفَجِّرَ
الْأَنْهَارَ خِلَالَهَا تَفْجِيرًا أَوْ تُسْقِطَ السَّمَاءَ كَمَا زَعَمْتَ عَلَيْنَا كِسْفًا أَوْ تَأْتِيَنَا بِاللَّهِ وَالْمَلَائِكَةِ قِيْلًا أَوْ
يَكُونُ لَكَ بَيْتٌ مِّن زُخْرَفٍ أَوْ تَرْفَىٰ فِي السَّمَاءِ وَلَن نُّؤْمِنَ لِرَبِّكَ حَتَّىٰ تُنْزِلَ عَلَيْنَا كِتَابًا نَقْرُوهُ قُلْ
سُبْحَانَ رَبِّيَ هَلْ كُنْتُ إِلَّا بَشَرًا رَسُولًا

And they say, “We will not believe you until you break open for us from the ground a spring . Or [until] you have a garden of palm trees and grapes and make rivers gush forth within them in force [and abundance]. Or you make the heaven fall upon us in fragments as you have claimed or you bring Allah and the angels before [us]. Or you have a house of ornament [i.e. gold] or you ascend into the sky. And [even then], we will not believe in your ascension until you bring down to us a book we may read.” Say, “Exalted is my Lord! Was I ever but a human messenger?”²

Likewise Allah سُبحانه وتعالى says:

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 153.

2 Sūrah al-Isrā': 90-93

وَلَوْ نَزَّلْنَاهُ عَلَيْكَ كِتَابًا فِي قِرْطَاسٍ فَلَمَسُوهُ بِأَيْدِيهِمْ لَقَالَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا إِنَّ هَذَا إِلَّا سِحْرٌ مُبِينٌ

And even if we had sent down to you, [O Muḥammad], a written scripture on a page and they touched it with their hands, the disbelievers would say, “This is not but obvious magic.”¹

Hence, those who asked the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ for a divine book from Allah are the disbelievers: the Jews and the Christians. Their demand was not granted.

Al-Kulaynī and his likes who spread this false belief then came about and intended to make this Ummah—the best of nations which has been selected for the benefit of mankind—worse in its disbelief than the Jews and the polytheist by averring that it did not believe in the divinely revealed books and scripts of Allah (i.e. it did not acknowledge and believe in the Twelve Imāms)

The verse is unequivocal in rendering the claims of the Shī'ah baseless, for if there was anything of the sort there would have at least been some type of indication to it in the Qur'ān without any rejection thereof. Or the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ would at least instruct the Ummah to hold on firmly to the revelations which descended upon Fāṭimah or 'Alī, or upon what was to descend upon the Imāms. However, we find none of the above, which clearly exposes the falsehood in these claims.

Furthermore, why would the Ummah transmit the Qur'ān and the Sunnah and brush aside these alleged books leaving them for a specific people to transmit them? And why didn't any member of the Ummah, any historian or any person belonging to any religion have any knowledge regarding them? And why do the Shī'ah differ so fiercely with regards to the divinely appointed Imāms if they are in possession of them?

Amazingly, I came across a narration in *al-Kāfī* which contradicts all of the above claims. This narration is narrated by Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ṣādiq (in whose name they forge all these narrations). He says:

1 Sūrah al-An'ām: 7.

إن لله عز و ذكره ختم بنبیکم النبیین فلا نبی بعده أبداً، و ختم بکتابکم الكتب فلا کتاب بعده أبداً و أنزل فيه تبیان کل شیء و خلقکم و خلق السماوات و الأرض و نبأ ما قبلکم و فصل ما بینکم و خبر ما بعدکم و أمر الجنة و النار و ما أنتم صائرُونَ إليه.

Allah ﷻ has sealed prophethood with the advent of your Nabī, hence there is no Nabī to come after him. He has likewise sealed all the books with the revelation of your Book so no book will descend thereafter. And Allah ﷻ has revealed in it the clarity of everything, your creation, the creation of the heavens and the earth, the stories of the previous nations, the deciding factors for your internal disputes, the information of the life to come, the tales of Jannah and Jahannam, and the final abode that you will one day return to.¹

This narration does not require any explanation or footnote. It by itself debunks all the previously mentioned claims and very sternly denies the revelation of any books.

In another narration al-Riḍā is reported to have said:

شریعة محمد صلی الله علیه و آله وسلم لا تنسخ إلى يوم القيامة فمن ادعی بعده نبوة أو أتى بعد القرآن بکتاب فدمه مباح لكل من سمع ذلك منه.

The Sharī'ah of Muḥammad ﷺ will not be abrogated till the Day of Judgement. Hence, whoever claims prophethood after him or produces a book besides the Qur'ān is lawful to kill for any person who hears that from him.²

Nonetheless, in these pages we have confronted the Shī'ah according to their mentality. Or else merely presenting their views are enough a refutation of them themselves; the Ummah unanimously concurs that there exists no divine book

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Kāfi* 1/31; *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/269; *Miftāḥ al-Kutub al-Arba'ah* 8/64-65; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 79/221, 11/34-35 (with reference to 'Ilal al-Sharā'i' of Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī).

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 79/221, 11/34-35 (with reference to 'Ilal al-Sharā'i').

besides the book of Allah ﷻ and that any person who claims to have a divine book other than the Qur'ān is a liar and a heretic.

What would the purpose of the revelation of the Qur'ān then be? Whereas Allah ﷻ says:

وَنَزَّلْنَا عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ بَيِّنَاتٍ لِّكُلِّ شَيْءٍ وَهُدًى وَرَحْمَةً وَبُشْرَىٰ لِلْمُسْلِمِينَ

And we have sent down to you the Book as clarification for all things and as guidance and mercy and good tidings for the Muslims.¹

Likewise:

إِنَّ هَذَا الْقُرْآنَ يَهْدِي لِلَّتِي هِيَ أَقْوَمُ وَيُبَشِّرُ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ الَّذِينَ يَعْمَلُونَ الصَّالِحَاتِ أَنَّ لَهُمْ أَجْرًا كَبِيرًا

Indeed, this Qur'ān guides to that which is most suitable and gives good tidings to the believers who do righteous deeds that they will have a great reward.²

And where are these divines books and scripts today? Is there any trace of them? And what is the benefit of them being secured by the awaited Mahdī?

It seems as if the pioneers of Shī'ism forged these narrations out of the fear that they would lose their following due to the fact that their belief system does not rest upon any firm basis in the Qur'ān. Over and above that, they were intent on plotting against this Ummah and its dīn, and distancing the Shī'ah from the rest of the Ummah with books other than the Book of Allah.

What is very astonishing is that there are many among the early and contemporary Shī'ah who deny the viewpoint of the interpolation of the Qur'ān, shun it aside as not being part of Twelver Shī'ism and rate the narrations (even though they

1 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 89.

2 Sūrah al-Isrā': 9.

be copious) of interpolation as forgeries which have seeped into the Twelver dogma. Yet they have not taken the same stance (as far as I know) regarding these erroneous claims which were initiated by al-Kulaynī and his cohorts; they have turned a blind eye toward them, whereas they are no less than the claim of interpolation in their gravity. Instead, Ibn Bābawayh and al-Ṭabarsī despite not believing in the interpolation of the Qurʾān, have also spread and transmitted these beguiling beliefs. Is this all because the Muslims are aware of the former claim of the Shīʿah and not the latter?

These claims entail some very serious consequences. Among them:

1. Revelation did not end and prophethood was not sealed,
2. the Imāms share a position equal to the Ambiyā' or even higher due to them receiving numerous books from the heavens which did not even materialise for the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ,
3. and considering the Ṣaḥābah in specific and the Ummah in general to be on falsehood because of not believing in these divine books.

These claims are one of the many signs wherefrom we gather that this cult has been infiltrated by inveterate liars who do not feel ashamed of blurting out any drivel; they have attributed lies to the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ by forging aḥādīth in his name, and they projected lies to Allah ﷻ by concocting these books. Only those who do not believe in Allah attribute lies to him.

2. Their claim that the Imāms are in possession of all the divine books

The Shīʿah claim that the Twelve Imāms are in possession of every book that descended from the heavens and that they can read them all despite their disparate languages. The author of *al-Kāfī* has established a chapter by the title, Chapter regarding the Imāms having possession of all the books which came down from Allah ﷻ, and that they are well acquainted with them despite their

different languages.¹ In this chapter he cites multiple narrations. The author of *Al-Biḥār* has also established a chapter with a similar title.² In this chapter he cites twenty-seven narrations.

These narrations state that:

كل كتاب نزل فهو عند أهل العلم ونحن هم.

The people of knowledge, meaning us, have the knowledge of every book that was revealed.³

Another narration states:

إن عندنا صحف إبراهيم والواح موسى

We have the scriptures of Ibrāhīm and the tablets of Mūsā.⁴

Likewise another narration mentions:

إن عندنا علم التوراة والانجيل والزبور وبيان ما في الألواح

We have knowledge of the Tawrah, the Injil, the Zabūr, and the details of the tablets.⁵

Yet there is another narration which gives a detailed account of the tablets of Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. It explains that they were made of the peridot of Jannah, they comprised of the clear exposition of everything that is to happen till the Day of Judgement, they were in the Hebrew language, and the Rasūl of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ gave them to Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ ordering him thus:

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/227.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/180.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* (with the commentary of al-Māzindarānī) 5/355.

4 *Ibid.*

5 *Ibid.*

دونك هذه ففيها علم الاولين و الآخرين و هي ألواح موسي و قد أمرني ربي أن أدفعها إليك. قال يا رسول الله لست احسن قراءتها، قال: إن جبرائيل أمرني أن أمرك أن تضعها تحت رأسك ليلتك هذه فإنك تصبح و قد علمت قراءتها قال: فجعلها تحت رأسه فأصبح و قد علمه الله كل شيء فيها فأمره رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم أن ينسخها في جلد شاة و هو الجفر و فيه علم الأولين و الآخرين، وهو عندنا.

“Hold on firmly to these! For in them is contained the knowledge of the first and the last; these are the tablets of Mūsā which Allah has ordered me to give to you.”

He said, “O Rasūl of Allah, I do not have the ability to read them.”

The Rasūl ﷺ replied, “Jibrīl has ordered me to instruct you to place them under your head tonight by virtue of which you will be able to read them by the morning.”

Hence ‘Alī states that he kept them under his head that night and by the morning Allah ﷻ had inspired him with the knowledge of everything therein. Subsequently, the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ told him to copy the contents thereof on the skin of big lamb. This skin thus contains the knowledge of the first to come and the last to come, and we are in possession of it.¹

This narration defines the lamb-skin to be comprehensive of the tablets of Mūsā. Another narration, however, does not stick to this; it states that Abū ‘Abd Allāh said:

إن عندي الجفر الأبيض... فيه: زبور داود، وتوراة موسي، وإنجيل عيسي، وصحف إبراهيم، والحلال والحرام، ومصحف فاطمة. ما أزعم أن فيه قرآنًا، وفيه ما يحتاج الناس إلينا ونحتاج إلي أحد، حتي فيه الجلدة، ونصف الجلدة، وربع الجلدة، وأرش الخدش.

Most certainly I am in possession of the white skin. It consists of the Zabūr of Dāwūd, the Tawrah of Mūsā, the Injīl of ‘Īsā, the scriptures of Ibrāhīm, the laws of permissible and impermissible entities, and the Muṣḥaf of Fāṭimah. I do not assume that it consists of any portion of the Qur’ān. In addition,

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/180.

it contains those aspects in which people will require our guidance and in which we will not require anyone; it also mentions the ruling of a lash, half a lash, a quarter of a lash, and even the ruling of scratch.¹

The commentator of *al-Kāfī* seemingly deemed all of this to be too much to be contained on the Jafr, skin of a lamb (as the previous narration asserts). Hence he says:

الظاهر أن الجفر وعاء فيه هذه الصحف لا أنها مكتوبة فيه.

It is apparent that the *Jafr* is a container wherein all these scriptures and books are kept and not a skin in which all of them are documented.²

Whereas the previous narration emphatically mentions that ‘Alī عليه السلام had documented them on the skin of lamb. This clearly suggests that the skin of a lamb can never possibly contain all of these books; especially when just one of these, i.e. the tablets of Mūsā contains the knowledge of the first and the last. It also tells us that the person who forged these narrations was not very adept at doing so. Similarly, every intelligent person will conclude that history would be something else all-together if the Imāms had knowledge of the first and the last.

The claim that the Imāms are in possession of all the divine books did not just remain a theory but it exceeded that to the practical realm. Hence, Abū al-Ḥasan is reported to have recited a portion of the Injīl before Barīh the Christian who after hearing him read the Injīl exclaims:

إياك كنت أطلب منذ خمسين سنة، ثم إن النصراني (كما تقول الرواية) آمن وحسن إسلامه. قال للإمام: إنني لكم التوراة والإنجيل وكتب الأنبياء؟ فقال: هي عندنا وراثتنا من عندهم نقرأها كما قرأوها. ونقولها كما قالوا: إن الله لا يجعل حجة في أرضه يسأل عن شيء فيقول لا أدري.

It is you that I was in search of for the past fifty years. Thereafter he embraced Islam on the hands of Abū al-Ḥasan and became a good Muslim.

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/340.

2 *Al-Māzindarānī: Sharḥ al-Jāmi‘* 5/389.

He then asks the Imām, “How did you procure the Tawrah, the Injil, and the books of the Ambiyā’?”

He said, “We obtained them by way of inheritance and we read them just as they would read them. And we also claim as they claimed: Allah does not place upon the earth his evidence (in the form of a messenger) who says ‘I don’t know,’ when asked regarding something.”¹

What this narration implies is that the Imāms study the Tawrah, the Injil, and other divine books just as the Ambiyā’ did in order to procure answers to the questions of people.

In fact the matter has exceeded this to the level that judgements and rulings will be passed in accordance with previous divine scriptures; the author of *al-Kāfi* has established a chapter titled, Chapter regarding the Imāms issuing rulings in accordance with the laws of Dāwūd and his family for which there will not be asked to produce any evidence.²

One of the narrations that he presents in the chapter reads as follows:

عن جعید الهمدانی عن علی بن الحسین رضي الله عنه قال: سألته بأي حكم تحكمون؟ قال: حكم آل داود فإن أعياننا شيعت تلقانا به روح القدس.

Ju‘aid al-Hamdānī narrates from ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn.

He says I asked him, “Based on which law do you issue rulings?”

He said, “With the law of the family of Dāwūd; if we happen to come across a complexity which we cannot resolve then the Holy Spirit inspires us with its answer.”³

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* (with the commentary *al-Jāmi‘*) 5/359; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/181,182; *al-Tawhīd* p. 286-288.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/359.

3 Ibid.

There are many similar narrations which state that even the Mahdī after his advent will issue rulings in accordance with the law of the family of Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام for which he will not have to provide evidence. These narrations contain multiple examples of the type of rulings the Mahdī will issue based on the special constitution that he will be granted, e.g. he will not accept taxes from the people of the book, he will kill every twenty year old who has not acquired the knowledge of dīn, he will issue rulings in accordance with the law of Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, and much more.¹

Likewise there are many narrations which state that ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would say,

لو تمكنت من الأمر لحكمت لكل طائفة بكتابها.

If I were to take charge of affairs I would issue rulings for every denomination in accordance with its book.²

One of these narrations state:

لو ثبت لي وسادة أو لو ثني لي الناس كما ثني لابن صوحان لحكمت بين أهل التوراة بالتوراة... ولحكمت بين أهل الإنجيل بالإنجيل... ولحكمت بين أهل الزبور بالزبور... ولحكمت بين أهل الفرقان بالفرقان.

If I were to take charge of affairs, or if people were to give me authority over their affairs just as they gave to Ibn Ṣūḥān,³ I would issue rulings in accordance with the Tawrah for the people of the Tawrah, for the people of the Injil in accordance with the Injil, for the people of the Zabur in accordance with the Zabur, and for the people of the Qur’ān in accordance with the Qur’ān.⁴

1 Ibid 1/398 onwards.

2 Al-Sha’rānī: *Ta’āliq ‘Ilmiyyah* (with the commentary of *al-kāfi* by al-Māzindarānī) 6/393.

3 Al-Majlisī says, “The mention of Ibn Ṣūḥān in the narration is strange, it was possibly Ibn Abī Sufyān. Nonetheless it means that if I had authority like Ibn Ṣūḥān amongst my followers...”

4 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 40/137.

Analysing this doctrine

Allah ﷻ sent Rasūl Allah ﷺ to all of mankind and Jinn. He sealed prophethood upon him, and abrogated all other religions by way of his religion:

وَمَنْ يَبْتَغِ غَيْرَ الْإِسْلَامِ دِينًا فَلَنْ يُقْبَلَ مِنْهُ وَهُوَ فِي الْآخِرَةِ مِنَ الْخَاسِرِينَ

And whoever desires other than Islam as religion—never will it be accepted from him, and he, in the Hereafter, will be among the losers.¹

It is reported that if Mūsā عليه السلام and ʿĪsā عليه السلام were alive they would be from his followers.² And when ʿĪsā عليه السلام will descend he will rule in accordance with the Sharīʿah of Muḥammad ﷺ³ because Allah ﷻ has abrogated all the divine books with the revelation of the Qurʾān; Allah ﷻ says:

وَأَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ الْكِتَابَ بِالْحَقِّ مُصَدِّقًا لِمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيْهِ مِنَ الْكِتَابِ وَمُهَيِّمًا عَلَيْهِ فَاحْكُم بَيْنَهُم بِمَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ وَلَا تَتَّبِعْ أَهْوَاءَهُمْ عَمَّا جَاءَكَ مِنَ الْحَقِّ لِكُلِّ جَعَلْنَا مِنْكُمْ شُرْعَةً وَمِنْهَا جَا وَلَوْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ لَجَعَلَكُمْ أُمَّةً وَاحِدَةً وَلَكِنْ لَيَبْلُوَكُمْ فِي مَا آتَاكُمْ فَاسْتَبِقُوا الْخَيْرَاتِ إِلَى اللَّهِ مَرْجِعُكُمْ جَمِيعًا فَيُنَبِّئُكُمْ بِمَا كُنتُمْ فِيهِ تَخْتَلِفُونَ. وَأَنْ أَحْكُم بَيْنَهُمْ بِمَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ وَلَا تَتَّبِعْ أَهْوَاءَهُمْ وَاحْذَرْهُمْ أَنْ يَفْتِنُوكَ عَنْ بَعْضِ مَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ إِلَيْكَ

And we have revealed to you, [O Muḥammad], the Book [i.e. the Qurʾān] in truth, confirming that which preceded it of the Scripture and as a criterion over it. So judge between them by what Allah has revealed and do not follow their inclinations away from what has come to you of the truth. To each of you we prescribed a law and a method. Had Allah willed, He would have made you one nation [united in religion], but [He intended] to test you in what He has given you; so race to [all that is] good. To Allah is your return all together, and He will [then] inform you concerning that over which you used to differ. And judge, [O Muḥammad], between them by what Allah has

1 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 85.

2 Sharḥ al-Ṭahāwīyyah p. 513.

3 Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 4/216; Sharḥ al-Ṭahāwīyyah p. 513.

revealed and do not follow their inclinations and beware of them, lest they tempt you away from some of what Allah has revealed to you.¹

Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī has written the following in his commentary on the verse, “So judge between them by what Allah has revealed”:

و هذا أمر من الله تعالى ذكره لنبيه محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم أن يحكم بين المحتكمين إليه من أهل الكتاب و سائر أهل الملل بكتابه الذي أنزله إليه و هو القرآن الذي خصه بشريعته، فالله سبحانه أنزل القرآن مصدقا لما بين يديه من الكتب و مهيمنا عليه، رقيبا يقضي علي ما قبله من سائر الكتب قبله

This is the command of Allah ﷻ directed to his Nabī Muḥammad ﷺ wherein he commands him to judge by way of the book which he revealed to him, i.e. the Qur’ān, which Allah ﷻ has made exclusive to his Sharī’ah, between those who seek his judgement whether they be from the People of the Book or from any other religion. This is because Allah ﷻ has revealed the Qur’ān as a confirmer of the truthfulness of the previous books, a guardian over them (from any distortions or interpolations), and a protector which has abrogated all the previous scriptures and books.²

Conversely, the books of the Shī’ah suggest that the Imāms will judge according to the law of Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام or that they will issue rulings for every denomination according to its book. So is this not violating the Sharī’ah of Islam? Or is it a call for unifying all the religions? This can serve as part of the evidence which asserts the fact that Shī’ism is the refuge of every religion and creed; wherein the deviant is able to find whatever deviation he desires and through the medium of which he is able to infuses poison into the dīn of Islam.

As for the claim of the Shī’ah that the Imāms are in possession of the books and scriptures of the Ambiyā’, they have no evidence to establish this besides a few claims which are not complemented by reality. How can this be possible for them when it was not the case for the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ, as is documented in the Ṣaḥīḥayn:

1 Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 48, 49.

2 Tafsīr Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī 6/268-269; Majmū’ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 19/218.

إن اليهود جاءوا إلي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فذكروا له أن رجلا منهم وامرأة زنيا. فقال لهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ما تجدون في التوراة في شأن الرجم؟ فقالوا: نفضحهم و يجلدون. فقال عبد الله بن سلام: كذبتُم، إن فيها الرجم. فأتوا بالتوراة فنشروها، فوضع أحدهم يده علي آية الرجم، فقرأ ما قبلها و ما بعدها. فقال له عبد الله بن سلام: ارفع يدك، فرفع يده، فإذا فيها آية الرجم، فقالوا: صدق يا محمد، فيها آية الرجم. فأمر بهما رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فرجما.

The Jews came to the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ and informed him of a man and a woman among them who had committed adultery.

The Rasūl of Allah ﷺ asked them, “What is the ruling in the Tawrāh with regards to lapidation (stoning)?”

They said, “We are required to disgrace them and lash them.”

‘Abd Allāh ibn Salām said, “You are lying, the ruling in the Tawrāh is that of lapidation.”

Subsequently, they brought the Tawrāh and opened it and one of them placed his hand on the verse of lapidation and read the verse before it and the verse after it.

‘Abd Allāh ibn Salām said to him, “Raise your hand.”

He raised his hand and from beneath it appeared the verse of lapidation.

Consequently, they conceded, “He has spoken the truth; the verse of lapidation actually does exist.”

Thereafter, the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ ordered that they be stoned.¹

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, chapter of merits: chapter regarding the verse, “They recognise him as they recognise their own sons.” 6/631; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, chapter of capital punishments, sub-chapter regarding the lapidation of the Jews and non-Muslim citizens, 2/1326; *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, chapter regarding capital punishments, sub-chapter regarding the lapidation of Jews, 4/593; *Sunan Ibn Mājah*, chapter of capital punishments, sub-chapter regarding the lapidation of the Jewish man and Jewish woman, 2/854-855; *Muwatta’ Mālik*, chapter regarding capital punishments, sub-chapter regarding lapidation, 2/819; *Musnad Aḥmad* 2/5; al-Shāfi’i: *al-Risālah* (the revised addition of Aḥmad Shākir): paragraph number: 692.

The scholars state regarding the question: What is the ruling in the Tawrah with regard to lapidation? It is possible that the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ had foreknown the ruling due to revelation from Allah ﷻ, or that he had obtained the knowledge thereof from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Salām and the other Jewish Rabbis who had accepted Islam, or it is very likely that he asked them regarding the ruling in the Tawrah in order to verify the veracity of their claim by seeking revelation from Allah ﷻ.¹

The scholars did not mention the possibility of him questioning them due to him having possession of the Tawrah. This proves that this doctrine is the innovation of the Shī‘ah.

If the claim of the Shī‘ah were valid, he would have opened the copy of the Tawrah which he had in his possession and showed them the ruling therefrom, or he would have instructed ‘Alī رضي الله عنه to produce it.

Nonetheless, the Shī‘ah also claim that the previous divine books which the Imāms are in possession of are free of interpolation and distortions. Whereas Allah ﷻ has in many places in the Qur’ān informed of us of how the People of the Book interpolated many verses and of how they even discarded a good portion thereof by way of which they were admonished. With the result that they were left with only a portion of the Book and were deprived of the rest of it due to their negligence.

When the People of the Qur’ān studied the history of the People of the Book it dawned upon them that the Jews had irretrievably lost the original Tawrah which Mūsā عليه السلام had written. Consequently, some of their Rabbis collaborated and endeavoured to re-write it from memory resulting in much of that which was not part of the Tawrah becoming part of it. The Tawrah that they have today establishes this.²

1 Al-Bāji: *al-Muntaqā* 7/133; *Faṭḥ al-Bārī* 12/168; ‘*Awn al-Ma’būd* 12/131.

2 *Tafsīr al-Manār* 6/396.

As for the Injīl, it suffers from more distortion and confusion than the Tawrāh. The different copies of the Zabūr differ from each other very drastically in many of the verses and meanings. Seeing which a person can definitively conclude that it is a fabrication against the actual Zabūr of Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام.¹

We are not in a position where we can study this phenomenon in depth. The objective is, however, to point out the conclusion of studies that show that all the previous divine books were not safe from distortion. Conversely, the Shī'ah claim that they are in possession of all these books and that they have not suffered from any distortion. If the Imāms really were in possession of the divine books it was their obligation to confront the Christians and the Jews, to bring them back on to the straight path and to bring to the fore the narrations and verses which contain within them mention of the emergence of Nabī ﷺ and the duty of being loyal to him. Had they done this, most of the Christians and Jews would have repented and this would have been widely known about them.

Perhaps the person who hears these claims will ask: Where are these divine books today and in whose possession are they? What is the purpose of them being in the possession of the Imāms, is it so that they perfect the constitution of Islam and will bring it to its culmination? And why do they not expose the interpolation of the People of the Book and establish evidence against them?

These are questions to which there are no answers, due to the simple reason that all these claims are fallacies which do not hold any water. These claims are not strange for a people who have attributed almost everything to their Imāms. What is really astonishing, however, is the multitudes of people who actually believe in them in today's world.

Therefore, we see that the Shī'ah also state that these books are meant to be secretive, that they are heavenly scriptures, and that they are the inheritance of the Ambiyā', etc., which are all in the possession of the Man in Occultation, the

1 Ibn Taymiyyah: *Daqā'iq al-Tafsīr* 3/58.

fictitious Mahdī. The followers of the Shī'ah have dangled upon this deceptive mirage many fallacies which follow one another.

Belief in the Prophets

The deviance of the Shī'ah in this respect is represented in many beliefs, e.g. the Imāms receive revelation¹ (as was previously mentioned in the section of Sunnah, likewise, under the issue of belief in the books), they are infallible, the necessity of adhering to their orders,² etc. They have by way of these beliefs accorded the Imāms the station of prophet-hood. Ibn Taymiyyah, therefore, says:

فمن جعل بعد الرسول معصوما يجب الإيمان بكل ما يقوله فقد أعطاه معني النبوة وإن لم يعطه لفظها

Whoever attributes infallibility to anyone averring that, after Rasūl Allah ﷺ, he is entitled to obedience in everything he says, has in essence accorded him the station of prophet-hood. Even though he does not verbally claim that.³

They have exceeded all bounds by further asserting that the Ambiyā' عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ were the followers of 'Alī, and that some of them were penalised due to not believing in his succession. One narration states:

عن حبة العرني قال: قال أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام: إن الله عرض ولايتي علي أهل السموات وأهل الأرض أقر بها من أقر، وأنكرها من أنكر، أنكرها يونس فحبسه الله في بطن الحوت حتى أقر بها.

Ḥabbah al-'Uranī mentions that Amīr al-Mu'minīn said, "Allah ﷻ presented my allegiance to the dwellers of the heavens and the inhabitants of the earth. Those that conceded, conceded and those that rejected, rejected. Yunus rejected. Allah ﷻ consequently imprisoned him in the belly of the fish till he conceded."⁴

1 In fact, they state that the Imāms only speak through revelation (see: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 17/155, 54/237).

2 Refer to the section regarding infallibility.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/174.

4 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/282; *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* p. 22.

They have many similar traditions in this regard.¹

Hence, they assert the following:

1. The Imāms are superior to the Ambiyā’.
2. They came with miracles in order to establish evidence against the entire creation.

These are the two aspects that I will be discussing in somewhat detail in the pages to come.

Holding the Imāms in Higher Esteem than the Ambiyā’

The prophets are the best of humans and the most deserving of the station of prophet-hood. Allah ﷻ prepared them for the highest level of servitude, the propagation of his message, and striving in his path. Allah ﷻ says:

اللَّهُ أَعْلَمُ حَيْثُ يَجْعَلُ رِسَالَتَهُ

Allah is most knowing of where [i.e. with whom] He places His message.²

Hence they enjoy the distinct privilege of prophet-hood over everyone else.³

Allah ﷻ has made obedience to them compulsory upon the creation. He, the Almighty, says:

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ رَّسُولٍ إِلَّا لِيُطَاعَ بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ

And we did not send any messenger except to be obeyed by permission of Allah.⁴

1 Al-Majlisī has made mention of them under the chapter regarding the Imāms being more superior to the Ambiyā’ 26/267-319.

2 Sūrah al-An‘ām: 124.

3 Al-Ḥulaymī: *al-Minhāj fī Shu‘ab al-Īmān* 1/238.

4 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 64.

No human is better than them. Al-Ṭaḥāwī mentions the following in his exposition of the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah:

ولا نفضل أحدا من الأولياء علي أحد من الأنبياء عليهم السلام ونقول: نبي واحد أفضل من جميع الأولياء

We do not hold any saint in higher esteem than the Ambiyā' عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام. Instead we confirm that one Nabī is better than all the saints.¹

Giving preference to the Imāms over the prophets is the stance of the extremist Shī'ah as is asserted by 'Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī,² al-Qāḍī 'Ayāḍ,³ and Ibn Taymiyyah.⁴ Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb states:

من اعتقد في غير الأنبياء كونه أفضل منهم و مساويا لهم فقد كفر، وقد نقل الإجماع علي ذلك غير واحد من العلماء

Whoever believes the superiority of anyone over the Ambiyā' or that he is equal to them in rank has left the fold of Islam. The consensus of the Ummah in this regard has been documented by many a scholars.⁵

Therefore, al-Qāḍī 'Ayāḍ states:

نقطع بتكفير غلاة الرافضة في قولهم: إن الأئمة أفضل من الأنبياء

We definitively conclude that the extremist Shī'ah are out of the fold of Islam due to their belief in the superiority of the Imāms over the Ambiyā'.⁶

1 Al-'Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwīyyah (with the commentary of Ibn Abī al-'Iz) p. 493.

2 Al-Baghdādī: Uṣūl al-Dīn p. 298.

3 Al-Qāḍī 'Ayāḍ: al-Shifā' p. 1078.

4 Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/177.

5 Risālah fī al-Radd 'alā al-Rawāfiq p. 29.

6 Al-Shifā' p. 1078.

Surprisingly, this is one of the cornerstone beliefs of Twelver Shī'ism. The author of *al-Wasā'il* has averred that the belief in the superiority of the Imāms over the Ambiyā' is a core tenet of the Shī'ī dogma, ascribing it to the Imāms.¹ He further says that the narrations confirming this belief are too many to be enumerated.² Likewise, in his *Biḥār al-Majlisī* has established a chapter named: *Chapter regarding the Imāms being superior to the Ambiyā' and the entire creation, regarding the covenant that was taken from them, the angels, and the entire creation; and regarding the high ranking prophets only attaining a high position due to their love for the Imāms*.³

Al-Majlisī, substantiates this belief with 88 narrations which are all attributed to the Twelvers⁴ and then says:

و الأخبار يعني أخبارهم في ذلك أكثر من أن يحصى وإنما أوردنا في هذا الباب قليلا منها وهي متفرقة في الأبواب لا سيما باب صفات الأنبياء وأصنافهم عليهم السلام و باب أنهم عليهم السلام كلمة الله و باب بدو أنوارهم و باب أنهم أعلم من الأنبياء و أبواب فضائل أمير المؤمنين و فاطمة صلوات الله عليهما.

And the narrations in this regard are too many to be enumerated, we have just cited a few of them. They are all scattered in different chapters, especially the chapters regarding the qualities of the Ambiyā' and their different categories, the chapter regarding the Imāms being the word of Allah, the chapter regarding the radiance of their light, the chapter regarding them being more knowledgeable than the Ambiyā', and the chapters containing the virtues of Amīr al-Mu'minīn and Fāṭimah.⁵

In his *I'tiqādāt*, which the Shī'ah treat as a fundamental book in the Imāmiyyah canon, Ibn Bābawayh states:

1 *Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah fī Uṣūl al-A'immaḥ*: chapter regarding Nabī ﷺ and the Imāms being better than all the creation i.e. the prophets, their successors, the angels and everyone else: p. 151.

2 Ibid p. 154.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/267-319.

4 Ibid 26/267-319.

5 Ibid 26/297-298.

يجب أن يعتقد أن الله عز وجل لم يخلق خلقاً أفضل من محمد صلي الله عليه وآله وسلم والأئمة، وأنهم أحب الخلق إلي الله عز وجل وأكرمهم وأولهم إقراراً به لما أخذ الله ميثاق النبيين في الذر، وأن الله تعالي أعطى كل نبي علي قدر معرفته نبينا صلي الله عليه وآله وسلم وسبقه إلي الإقرار به، ويعتقد أن الله تعالي خلق جميع ما خلق له ولأهل بيته عليهم السلام وأنه لولاهم ما خلق السماء ولا الأرض ولا الجنة ولا النار ولا آدم ولا حواء ولا الملائكة ولا شيئاً مما خلق صلوات الله عليهم أجمعين.

It is mandatory to believe that Allah ﷻ has not created anyone better than Muḥammad ﷺ and the Imāms, that they are the most beloved of his creation to him and the most honourable, and that they were the first to acknowledge the covenant of the prophets in the *Dhar* (realm of particles after the creation of Ādam ﷺ). And that Allah ﷻ granted every Nabī his favours and bounties based on his submission to Rasūl Allah ﷺ and his advancement in conceding his prophet-hood. Likewise he should believe that Allah has created whatever he has created for him and for his household ﷺ; if it was not for them he would not have created the heavens, the earth, Jannah, Jahannam, Ādam, Ḥawwā', the angels, and any of his other creation, may the peace of Allah descend upon them.¹

The author of *Biḥār* after citing this text in his book explains thus:

اعلم أن ما ذكره رحمة الله من فضل نبينا وأئمتنا صلوات الله عليهم علي جميع المخلوقات وكون أئمتنا أفضل من سائر الأنبياء هو الذي لا يرتاب فيه من تتبع أخبارهم عليهم السلام علي وجه الإذعان واليقين، والأخبار في ذلك أكثر من أن تحصي... وعليه عمدة الإمامية ولا يأتي ذلك إلا جاهل بالأخبار.

Know well that whatever he has mentioned pertaining to the superiority of our Nabī and our Imāms over all the creations and regarding the merit of our Imāms over all the Ambiyā' is something that a keen follower of their legacy cannot doubt at all. For the traditions in this regard are beyond count... This is the core belief of the Imāmiyyah which only an ignoramus can deny.²

1 *I'tiqādāt* p. 106-107.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/297-298.

Some have, in fact, even written exclusive books on this topic.¹

This is the very same belief of Khomeini, as he has asserted in his book *al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah*, and his cohorts in contemporary times openly proclaim (the text will be quoted shortly).

In attributing merit to the Imāms, these narrations make claims which are steeped in exaggeration and deviance, and which make the hair on the bodies of the believers stand on ends (some of these have passed in the sections regarding their belief in the oneness of Allah in terms of Him being the deity and the nourisher).

Furthermore, the Imāms are not only superior to the Ambiyā'. But all the merits that the Ambiyā' enjoy is due to *Wilāyah* (allegiance). Their Imām is reported to have said:

ما استوجب آدم أن يخلقه الله بيده و وينفخ فيه من روحه إلا بولاية علي عليه السلام و ما كلم الله موسى تكليماً إلا بولاية علي عليه السلام ولا أقام الله عيسى ابن مريم آية للعالمين إلا بالخضوع لعلي عليه السلام ثم قال أجمل الأمر ما استأهل خلق من الله النظر إليه إلا بالعبودية لنا

Ādam عليه السلام did not deserve the privilege of Allah creating him with his hand and blowing in him his soul but because of his allegiance to 'Alī عليه السلام. And Allah did not directly converse with Mūsā but because of his allegiance to 'Alī عليه السلام. Nor did Allah سبحانه وتعالى establish 'Īsā ibn Maryam as his sign but because of his servitude to 'Alī. He then said, "The best of them all is that no one becomes worthy of seeing his (Allah's) countenance but after his allegiance to us."²

1 For example, the books *Tafḍīl al-A'immaḥ 'alā al-Ambiyā'*, *Tafḍīl al-'Alī عليه السلام 'alā Ulī al-'Azm min al-Rusul* (the books of Hāshim al-Baḥrānī D. 1107 A.H.), *Tafḍīl al-A'immaḥ 'alā Ghayr jaddihim min al-Ambiyā'*, *Tafḍīl Amūr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī 'alā man 'adā Khātam al-Nabiyyīn* (the work of Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī D. 1111 A.H.) etc. Surprisingly, one of their scholars has written a book with the title *Tafḍīl al-Qā'im al-Mahdī 'alā Sā'ir al-A'immaḥ*. A book written by a Persian by the name Faṭḥ 'Alī Shāh D. 1250 A.H. See *al-Dharī'ah* 4/358-360.

2 *Al-Ikhtiṣāṣ* p. 250; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 26/294.

If I were to go on citing similar narrations from *Bihār* and other books, I would cover many lengthy pages.¹

Despite all the changes and developments the Twelver dogma has underwent, it seems as if this has remained a principle belief; which is not odd because al-Māmaqānī suggests that the nature of the dogma is progression toward extremism.

The Shī'ah in this issue, i.e. the issue of the Imāms being superior to the Ambiyā' have diversified into three sects (as al-Ash'arī states):

1. A sect that believes that the Ambiyā' are better than the Imāms. Some among the adherents of this sect allow the position of the Imāms being superior to the angels.
2. A sect that believes that the Imāms are superior to the Ambiyā' and the angels.
3. And a sect that together with believing in Imāmah believe in rationalism as well. They say that the angels and the Ambiyā' are superior to the Imāms.²

Al-Mufīd has added a forth sect in his book *Awā'il al-Maqālāt*, and that is the sect that asserts that the Imāms are better than the Ambiyā' with the exception of the *Ulū al-'Azm* (the five Resolute Ambiyā', referring to the five high ranking prophets) He thereafter does not express his preference but chooses to rather remain silent.³

Ostensibly, all of these sects have disintegrated with the efforts of the scholars of the Safawid Empire and the extremist stance of giving preference to the Imāms

1 Refer to the twenty sixth volume of *Bihār*, especially the chapter: the preference of the Imāms over the Ambiyā': p. 267-319; and the chapter: the prayers of the Ambiyā' being accepted due to them supplicating to Allah through the medium of the Imāms: p. 319-334.

2 *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/120.

3 *Awā'il al-Maqālāt* p. 42-43.

over the Ambiyā' has prevailed in the Shī'ī dogma. To the extent that al-Majlisī in his *Biḥār* mentions the following under the chapter which he has dedicated to this topic:

إن أولي العزم إنما صاروا أولي العزم بحبهم صلوات الله عليهم

Verily the resolute Ambiyā' procured the status of being resolute due to their love for the Imāms.

He does not exclude any of them, not even our Nabī Muḥammad ﷺ.

Likewise, they have narrations which draw a comparison between Rasūl Allah ﷺ and 'Alī. These narrations ultimately conclude that 'Alī رضي الله عنه has more merit than Rasūl Allah ﷺ due to him sharing all the accolades and feats of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and exclusively being the holder of many feats which Rasūl Allah ﷺ does not share with him. The author of *Biḥār* has even established a chapter by the title: *Chapter regarding Rasūl Allah saying to 'Alī, 'You have been bestowed with three merits which I was not granted'*.¹

Al-Kāfī, *Biḥār*, and other books are filled with narrations which suggest that 'Alī رضي الله عنه and the Imāms hold the same status as Rasūl Allah ﷺ and deserve the obedience that he enjoys. But these narrations then progress to a point where

1 See: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 39/89. Here is a narration which appears therein:

Rasūl Allah ﷺ said, "I have been given three merits which 'Alī shares with me and 'Alī has been bestowed with three merits which I do not share with him."

It was asked, "O Rasūl Allah! What are the three merits which 'Alī shares with you?"

He replied, "I possess the flag of Ḥamd (praise) and 'Alī is its bearer, the Kawthar belongs to me but 'Alī will be the one serving therefrom, and Jannah and Jahannam are for me but 'Alī will be my partner in them. And as for the three merits which I do not share with him, they are the following: he is granted a cousin like me but I have not been granted someone like him, he has been bestowed with Fāṭimah and I have not been granted a wife like her, and he is blessed with Ḥasan and Ḥusayn whereas I am not blessed with sons like them."

See: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 39/90; *Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā* p. 212; *Manāqib Āl Abī Ṭālīb* 2/48.

they assert that the Imāms are superior to Rasūl Allah ﷺ. Instead they posit that ‘Alī and the Imāms enjoy such feats and merits that no one else in the creation enjoys. By deliberating over these feats and merits you will realise that they are the exclusive attributes of Allah ﷻ. An illustration of one such feat will suffice to show what the Shī‘ah attribute to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه:

لم يفتني ما سبقني ولم يعزب عني ما غاب عني

Whatever preceded me has not missed me and whatever is not in my reach
is not unknown to me.¹

How grave are their fabrications against Allah ﷻ, his Dīn, his Nabī ﷺ, ‘Alī, and the Ahl al-Bayt. Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه expressed his disapproval against those who gave preference to him over Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما, and sounded a warning of inflicting upon such people the punishment of a calumniator.² In eighty different transmissions which have been widely reported from him he is recorded to have said upon the pulpit of Kūfah, “The most virtuous of this Ummah after its Nabī is Abū Bakr and ‘Umar,”³ which the books of the Shī‘ah have also documented.⁴ What would his reaction be if he were to learn that this cult which claims to be his partisans accords more virtue to him than even the Ambiyā’ of Allah? His refutation of them will without a doubt be much more stern and severe. Some scholars are of the opinion that a person who holds ‘Alī رضي الله عنه in higher esteem than Ibrāhīm عليه السلام or Muḥammad ﷺ is steeped in more disbelief than the Jews and Christians.⁵

The books of the Shī‘ah report that when Amīr al-Mu‘minīn was told, “You are a prophet.” he responded saying,

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/197. The author has documented many narrations of this sort (see: p. 847, 848 of this book wherein I shall present some narrations).

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/137. This has been recorded with authentic chains of transmission (see: *al-Fatāwā* 28/475).

3 *Ibid* 4/137-138.

4 *Talkhīṣ al-Shāfi* 2/428; *An al-Shī‘ah wa Ahl al-Bayt* p. 52.

5 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/69.

Woe unto you! I am just a servant of Muḥammad ﷺ.¹

Ibn Bābawayh explaining this statement says, “I.e. a servant in terms of loyalty, nothing more.”²

It is very possible that this extremist stance which became the basis of the Twelver dogma is due to the influence of one of the ancient Shīʿī sects which alleged that ‘Alī is superior to Muḥammad ﷺ. It was known as the ‘Albā’iyyah.³

And according to me the doctrine of the infallibility of the Imāms led to the birth of this stance and many others. This is because they ascribe to the Imāms such attributes which none of the messengers and Ambiyā’ of Allah ﷻ possess.

But when a person resorts to the Qur’ān he will not find any mention of the Twelve Imāms let alone them being more virtuous than the Ambiyā’. Just as he will notice that the Ambiyā’ due to their lofty rank are mentioned before the pious as in the verse:

فَأُولَٰئِكَ مَعَ الَّذِينَ أَنْعَمَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِمْ مِنَ النَّبِيِّينَ وَالصِّدِّيقِينَ وَالشُّهَدَاءِ وَالصَّالِحِينَ

They will be with the ones upon whom Allah has bestowed favour of the prophets, the steadfast affirmers of truth, the martyrs, and the righteous.⁴

1 Ibn Bābawayh: *al-Tawḥīd* p. 174, 175; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 8/283; *al-Iḥtijāj* (same pages as previous).

2 *al-Tawḥīd* p. 175.

3 ‘Albā’iyyah: the followers of al-‘Albā’ ibn Dhirā’ al-Dawsī or al-Asadī. He would give preference to ‘Alī over Nabī ﷺ and he would make denigrating remarks regarding him saying that he was sent to invite people toward ‘Alī but he invited the people to himself (*al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* 1/175; *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 571, the name therein is ‘Alyā’iyyah; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/305).

4 *Mukhtaṣar al-Ṣawāqi* p. 187.

Allah ﷻ has mentioned four categories of the successful in this verse.¹ And the Qur'ān in all its verses asserts the selection and nomination of the Ambiyā' over the entire world.²

Likewise, the Muslims of the first three centuries unanimously concur that the Ambiyā' are superior to everyone. This consensus is evidence against the Shī'ah, especially because all the Imāms were from those times.³

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

اتفق سلف الأمة وأئمتها و سائر أولياء الله تعالى علي أن الأنبياء أفضل من الأولياء الذين ليسوا بأنبياء.

The predecessors of the Ummah comprising of its scholars and saints all concur that the Ambiyā' are more virtuous than the pious who are not prophets.⁴

Even reason clearly suggests that making obedience to a Nabī mandatory, appointing him as the sole commander, prohibitor and sovereign ruler, and appointing the Imām as his deputy and subject... cannot be understood without the superiority of the Nabī over the Imām. This phenomenon is true for every Nabī but not for every Imām. Therefore, an Imām can never be more virtuous than a Nabī. It is impossible.⁵

Furthermore, in the books of the Shī'ah there are narrations which are in harmony with the text of the Qur'ān, the consensus of the Ummah, and reason. They debunk these heresies; the narration which al-Kulaynī narrates from Hishām al-Aḥwal, who narrates from Zayd ibn 'Alī reads as follows:

1 *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 11/221.

2 *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* p. 101.

3 *Mukhtaṣar al-Sawāqī* p. 186-187.

4 *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 11/221.

5 *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* p.101

The Ambiyā' are better than the Imāms. Whoever, believes anything else is astray.¹

Likewise, Ibn Bābawayh has narrated from al-ṣādiq that the Ambiyā' are more beloved to Allah سبحانه وتعالى than 'Alī.²

Lastly, there is no doubt regarding the falsehood of this stance; its falsehood can be identified by reason, the categorically established aspects of dīn, and history. There is no effort required to debunk it and it is one of the proofs of the corruptness of the Shī'ī dogma.

The miracles of the Imāms

The stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding miracles³ is that no one besides the Ambiyā' عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام have the capacity to produce them.⁴ As opposed to the Shī'ah who aver that one of the signs of an Imām is that he should be able to produce miracles. Because they believe that Imāmah is the continuation of prophet-hood.⁵ Hence

1 Mukhtaṣar al-Ṣawāqī' p. 187.

2 Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah p. 100.

3 **Miracles** are signs and evidences which no one has the ability to produce besides Allah and which Allah brings to being at the hands of his prophets in order to establish their truthfulness. Ibn Taymiyyah has mentioned that the word Mu'jizāt (miracles) does not exist in the Qur'ān and the Sunnah; only the words Āyah (sign), Bayyinah (evidence), and Burhān (proof) feature in them (*al-Jawāb al-Ṣaḥīḥ* 4/67). He further states that Mu'jizah literally refers to anything which is against the norm. According to the tradition of the early scholars like Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal and others miracles were termed Āyāt (signs). However the later scholars make a distinction in the terms Mu'jizah and Karāmah; the former refers to the miracle of a prophet and the latter to the miracle of a saint although they both share the meaning of being against the norm. (See: *Qā'idah fī al-Mu'jizāt wa al-Karāmāt* (published by al-Manār) p. 2; *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 11/311-312; Ibn Taymiyyah: *al-Nubuwwāt*; al-Jurjānī: *al-Ta'rīfāt* p. 282; *Sharḥ al-'Aqīdah al-Taḥāwīyyah* p. 495).

4 Ibn Ḥazm: *al-Muḥallā* 1/35.

5 'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah p. 94.

just as Allah ﷻ selects who he intends for prophet-hood and aids him by way of miracles, likewise does he handpick who he wants for the station of Imāmah.¹

Their ḥadīth books are replete with traditions and tales pertaining to them. All they did is that they named the *karāmāt* (the miracles of saints) *muʿjizāt* (miracles of the prophets).

No doubt it is one of the principle beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah to believe in the miracles of saints and all the extraordinary events that materialised on their hands. This applies to miracles related to various types of knowledge, divine inspirations, different types of abilities, and ways of impacting others; as is narrated regarding the early nations in Sūrah al-Kahf and other sūrahs, and is reported regarding the Ṣaḥābah, their successors, and the people of the early generations. And miracles will always exist in this Ummah till the Day of Judgment.²

Naming the *Karāmāt* as *Muʿjizāt* is thus merely a difference of terminology. Therefore, Ibn Taymiyyah criticized the statement of Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, “and many *muʿjizāt* materialised on his hands,” with the following:

فكانه يسمي كرامات الأولياء معجزات وهذا اصطلاح كثير من الناس فيقال علي أفضل من كثير ممن له كرامات متوابة عن كثير من عوام أهل السنة الذين يفضلون أبا بكر وعمر فكيف لا تكون الكرامات ثابتة لعلي رضي الله عنه، وليس في مجرد الكرامات ما يدل علي أنه أفضل من غيره

It is as though he is naming the *Karāmāt* of the pious *Muʿjizāt*; this (the interchangeable nature of both the words) is the terminology of many people. It is thus said, “Alī is superior to many a people who have *Karāmāt*. *Karāmāt* are authentically proven to have materialised at the hands of the commonality of the Ahl al-Sunnah who give preference to Abū Bakr and ‘Umar so why would there not be any *Karāmāt* reported from ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.” But mere *Karāmāt* cannot be the criterion for his superiority over others.³

1 *Aṣl al-Shīʿah wa Uṣūlūhā* p. 58.

2 *Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 3/156.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/156.

Ibn Taymiyyah was of the view that the reason why the Shī'ah lend so much of importance to what they attribute to their Imāms is that they—because of their ignorance, oppression, and distance from the ways of the friends of Allah—do not experience any noteworthy miracles. Hence when they, because of their bankruptcy in this regard, hear of a miracle they extol it just as a pauper extols money and a famished person extols a piece of bread.¹

However, do the Shī'ah really consider these supernatural occurrences to be Karāmāt and merely call them Mu'jizāt?

A person who reflects over the Twelver dogma will learn that they have an entirely different stance in this regard; they assert that Mu'jizāt are indispensable to establish Imāmah and inculcate the creation. Because, as they allege, their Imāms are the evidence of Allah under the skies and above the earth.²

In fact al-Kulaynī mentions:

إن الحجة لا تقوم لله علي خلقه إلا بإمام

The evidence of Allah cannot be established upon the creation but through an Imām.³

There are multiple narrations of this nature. Hence, the Imāms are reported to have said:

فنحن حجج الله في عبادہ

We are the evidence of Allah upon his bondsmen.

And:

1 Ibid 4/196.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/192; al-Muṣaffar: *ʿĀlam al-Imām* p. 43.

3 This a chapter in *al-Kāfī* which comprises of four narrations (*Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/177).

If it was not for us Allah would not have been worshipped.¹

Another narration states:

الأوصياء هم أبواب الله عز وجل التي يؤتي منها ولولا هم ما عرف الله عز وجل، وبهم احتج الله تبارك وتعالى على خلقه

The successors (Imāms) are the doors of Allah wherefrom he is approached; if it was not for them Allah would not have been recognised, and through them Allah established his evidence upon his creation.

Hence, al-Baḥrānī says in his book which he has written about the Muʿjizāt of the Imāms:

أظهر علي أيديهم المعاجز والدلائل لأنهم حجته علي عباده

Muʿjizāt and proofs come to being on their hands because they are the evidence of Allah upon his creation.²

From the aforementioned it is clear that they treat the Imāms like the Ambiyā' and messengers of Allah through whose medium Allah establishes evidence upon the creation. Hence they also require Muʿjizāt to prove their selection for his mission just as the Ambiyā' required.

Instead the Imāms have, in terms of their virtue, the obligation of obedience to them and the materialisation of Muʿjizāt procured the rank of the best of prophets and the greatest of them. Abū 'Abd Allah says (as they allege):

ما جاء به علي رضي الله عنه آخذ به وما نهى عنه أنتهى عنه جري له من الفضل مثل ما جري لمحمد صلي الله عليه وآله

I implement everything 'Alī came with and I refrain from everything he prohibited. He enjoys the status of Muhammad ﷺ....

1 Ibid 1/193.

2 Al-Baḥrānī: *Yanābī' al-Ma'ājiz* p. 2.

Likewise is the virtue of each successive Imām. They allege that Amīr al-Mu'minīn would often say:

لقد أعطيت خصالا ما سبقني إليها أحد قبلي، علمت المنايا و البلايا و الأنساب و فضل الخطاب، فلم يفتني ما سبقني و لم يعزب عني ما غاب عني أبشر بإذن الله و أودي عنه كل ذلك مكنتني فيه يعلمه

I have been bestowed with qualities which no one before me ever had. I have been taught the knowledge of death, difficulties, lineages, and the unmistakable judgment. Hence, what preceded me has not missed me and what is away from me is not unknown to me. I give glad tidings with the permission of Allah and I discharge all these matters on his behalf. He has given me a good grasp over them through His knowledge.¹

As you will notice, adhering to any of the Imāms is equivalent to adhering to Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ or even more virtuous. Hence, Imām Ja'far prefers adhering to 'Alī rather than to Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ according to them.² He then substantiates this by making mention of the miracles and qualities 'Alī exclusively enjoyed apart from Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ; he says, "I am the one who will send people to Heaven or Hell," This is further emphasised by the statement, "I have been bestowed with qualities which no one before me ever had..." In this narration he confers upon 'Alī the attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى when he says, "I have been taught the knowledge of death and difficulties..." Likewise when he says, "What has preceded me has not missed me and what is away from me is not unknown to me..." The being who nothing is hidden from and who is such that nothing can miss him is only Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.

So in essence these are not miracles rather these are lies which deify the Imāms.

The Shī'ah nonetheless aver that these miracles materialised on the hands of the Imāms in order to establish the evidence of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى upon the creation and

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/196-197. There are many similar narrations all which feature in the chapter: Chapter regarding the Imāms being the foundation of the earth. (See: the section of infallibility in this book).

2 We exonerate Ja'far and all the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt from these heresies. If anyone believes that he can reach Allah without the medium of Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is a heretic and a disbeliever.

they are no ordinary miracles but they are Mu'jizāt like that of the Ambiyā' or even greater. The author of *Biḥār* has established a chapter with the title *Chapter regarding the Imāms having the ability to revive the dead, cure the congenitally blind and lepers, and the ability to produce all the Mu'jizāt of the prophets.*"¹ Therein he brings multiple narrations. And therefore, their Shaykh al-Qazwīnī defines the miracles of the prophets like this:

ما كان خارقا للعادة أو صارفا للقدرة عند التحدي مع عدم المعارضة، والمطابقة للدعوي

Whatever is against the norm, incapacitates the abilities (of others) in a challenge, reigns supreme and is in harmony with the claim is a miracle.²

This definition also affirms the fact that these miracles are meant for challenges to validate the claims of the Imāms.

They have written voluminous books regarding the Mu'jizāt of their Imāms in a similar manner the Ahl al-Sunnah write books about the Mu'jizāt of Rasūl Allah ﷺ.³ Their narrations in this regard in fact elevate the Imāms from the realm

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/29-31.

2 *Qalā'id al-Kharā'id* p. 72.

3 E.g. the book: Ḥusayn ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb (of the fifth century): 'Uyūn al-Mu'jizāt this book has been published for the third time by the A'lāmī institution for publications in the year 1403 A.H. hereunder are some of the miracles mentioned therein:

The Imāms revive the dead (p. 32), they can communicate with animals and the animals testify to their Imāmah (p. 17, 22, 25, 32), they tell the people about the knowledge of the past and the future (p. 57), and they can envisage all the actions of people through a pillar of light which is with them from the time they are born (p. 80), etc.

And the book of Hāshim al-Baḥrānī: *Yanābī' al-Ma'ājiz wa Uṣūl al-Dalā'il*. In this book there are twenty one chapters; the title of the fifth chapter is 'the Imāms have knowledge of what is in the heavens, what is in the earth, the knowledge of the past, the knowledge of the future, the knowledge of whatever happens during the day and the night, the knowledge of every moment, the knowledge of the prophets and much more (p. 35-42). The sixth chapter is: chapter regarding the Imāms having the ability to procure knowledge whenever they desire, regarding their hearts being the locus of the will of Allah and when Allah intends something they intend it as well (p. 43-46).

of humanity to the status of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, the one and only Creator.

Nonetheless, this cult has a unique obsession with narrating strange tales which at time seem as if they are the doings of magicians and tricksters and at time seem as if they are wild imaginations or weird dreams. They still then claim that this is the fundamental evidence for the establishment of Imāmah. Instead they have ascribed miracles to the followers of the Imāms which are equal in their magnanimity to that of the Imāms.¹

Someone might assume that these tales might have been long forgotten with the demise of the Imāms. It is rather the opposite; these miracles are renewed and reborn in the Shī'ī world today, not only by reading them in gatherings and stupefying the brains. But they have taken a practical form which is represented in two ways:

continued from page 852

Al-Baḥrānī has another book as well. It is probably the most extensive book on the subject. He has named it *Madīnah al-Ma'ājiz*. Therein he mentions the miracles of each Imām separately. E.g. The first chapter is regarding the Mu'jizāt of 'Alī and it contains five hundred and fifty miracles. Some amongst them are: the miracles of his birth (p. 5), the communication of Allah with him (p. 9), his ascension to the heavens (p. 12), the communication of the earth with him (p. 16), and the communication of Shayṭān with him (p. 16). He also makes mention of many miracles which transpired before his death. One of them is that 'Alī was present by the pharaoh of Egypt. Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ thus said to him, "Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى aided the prophets with you discreetly and he aided me with you openly."

In this manner he makes mention of the miracles of every Imām, even the fictitious 'awaited' Mahdī who does not have any existence. Some of his miracles are: he read the divine books at the time of his birth and he ascended to throne of Allah, etc. He goes on to mention such incidents which a sane person cannot fathom. They make one wonder as to what extent their scholars have gone in exploiting and beguiling the masses. And makes one wonder as to how gullible people actually are to follow such fallacies.

1 Ḥusayn 'Abd al-Wahhāb: *Uyūn al-Mu'jizāt* P. 101: Al-Kāẓim attests that Rashīd al-Hajarī has knowledge of death. And in *Rijāl al-Kashshī* it is mentioned that he would meet a person and tell him, "You are going like this and you are going to be killed like this. And that person would die as he would say." (*Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 76).

1. In the miracles which they ascribe and attribute to the ‘awaited’ Mahdī which a group of his close associates narrate from him. For example, Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī at one occasion borrowed a very voluminous book from a person who when lending it to him only allowed him to use it for a night. He says that the Mahdī came to his aid and wrote the entire book for him in one night.¹ The miraculous incidents which they claim transpired through the intervention of the Mahdī are numerous. Al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī has mentioned a good amount of them in his book *Jannat al-Ma’wā*. Hence, till today as they allege many miracles occur through the medium of the Mahdī which he causes to materialise on the hands of the scholars of the Shī‘ah.
2. In the miracles which they claim transpire at the graves of the Imāms thereby misguiding their people from the straight path and inducing them to indulge in polytheism. Al-Majlisī has established many chapters in his *Biḥār* discussing these miracles, e.g. the twenty ninth chapter: *the Mu’jizāt and Karāmāt that transpired at the sacred grave*,² and the fiftieth chapter: *the desecration of his grave by the rulers and the miracles that transpired from it, its sand, and when visiting it*.³ He goes on, in this manner, mentioning the alleged miracles of every Imām. In this regard as well they have compiled many books.⁴

These tales tell us of the miracles that occurred at the tombs of the Imāms. Al-Majlisī has cited many of them in separate chapters which he has established for every Imām. In them he brings fictitious stories that leave one wondering at the extent to which these people love fables which have found a path to their hearts very easily.

1 The details have passed on page 461 of this book.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 42/311.

3 Ibid 45/390.

4 E.g. Muḥammad ‘Alī al-Baldāwī: *al-Mu’jizāt*. In this book he has compiled all the ‘miracles’ which he alleges transpired at the graves of the Kāzimīs and the ‘Askarīs (See: *al-Dharī‘ah* 21/215).

Stories that speak of incurable diseases being cured. One such story says that the vision of a blind person was restored just by him visiting the tomb of an Imām.¹ They also speak of animals who came to the graves of the Imāms to ask them for cure. Hence, a narration makes mention of an animal which was rolling in the sand near the grave asking for cure after which it was cured.²

Instead they have allegedly attributed to the Imāms (whilst they are enclosed in their graves) the ability of doing the actions and transactions of the living. Hence, it is mentioned that if trusts are entrusted to the inmate of the grave he will safeguard it.³

Seemingly, the fabricator of these fables was not content with the money that he collected from the ignorant people who lavishly spent at the graves of the Imāms and thus he tried to get more out of them through stealing and deception.

Likewise, the grave can be addressed and it will respond. A narration mentions that one of the visitors of the grave tore his shawl and said that he wanted its compensation only from the inmate of the grave. Subsequently his wish was fulfilled.⁴

All of these incidents are presented in a style of narratives in order to affect the hearts of the riffraff and the commonality. They are contained in long tales which in essence conclude in ascribing partners with Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, stupefying the brains, shunning intellect, and preventing a person from doing virtuous deeds. At times they can lead a person to disbelief and complete renouncement of Īmān if he believes them to be logically necessary.

Ja'far al-Ṣādiq found many of the exaggerations the people of Kūfah attributed to him to be reprehensible. Hence, he says:

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 42/317.

2 *Ibid* 42/312.

3 *Ibid* 42/318.

4 *Ibid* 42/316.

و لله لو أفررت بما يقول في أهل الكوفة لأخذتني الأرض، وما أنا إلا عبد مملوك لا أقدر علي شيء
بضر ولا بنفع

If I were to concede the claims of the people of Kūfah the earth would swallow me. I am not but a servant who belongs to Allah; I do not have the capacity to give benefit nor inflict harm.¹

It is very likely that these exaggerated claims regarding the Imāms which have raised the Imāms to the status of Allah and which they call Mu'jizāt are inherited from the Zoroastrians who disguise themselves as partisans of the Ahl al-Bayt in order to conspire against Islam, or in order to introduce their beliefs into the dīn with the name of Islam. This is because the Zoroastrians attribute more miracles to Zarādasht than the Christians did to Īsā.²

As for their claim that their Imāms are the evidence of Allah سُبحانه وتعالى upon his creation without whom the creation cannot be inculpated and thus miracles transpired on their hands, this is a claim for which if you were to search for any shred of evidence in the Qur'ān you will not find any. Instead you will find the complete opposite, i.e. the proof of Allah سُبحانه وتعالى was established upon his creation through his messengers and prophets. Allah سُبحانه وتعالى says:

لَئَلَّا يَكُونَنَّ لِلنَّاسِ عَلَى اللَّهِ حُجَّةٌ بَعْدَ الرُّسُلِ

So that mankind will have no argument against Allah after the messengers.³

It is therefore clear that all these claims are pure fabrications.

As for the miracles which they attribute to the graves of the Imāms and to the 'awaited' hidden Mahdi, they are also lies and fabrications which stem from the evil inspirations of Shayṭān. Because the 'hidden' Imām does not have any

1 *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* 3/332.

2 *Tathbīt Dalā'il al-Nubuwwah* 1/185.

3 *Sūrah al-Nisā'*: 165.

existence, as many sects among the Shī'ah confirm and as is documented by the scholars of lineage and history, except of course in the imagination of the Shī'ah. The miracles of the graves and the tombs are the invitations of the devil to ascribing partners with Allah, for these are dead people who have reached what they had sent forth and who do not possess for themselves any harm or benefit. And they would whilst they were alive resort to Allah and negate all strength and ability from themselves.

The books of the Shī'ah have also cited many narrations of this sort. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى instructs his Nabī to say:

قُلْ لَا أَمْلِكُ لِنَفْسِي نَفْعًا وَلَا ضَرًّا إِلَّا مَا شَاءَ اللَّهُ

Say, "I hold not for myself [the power of] benefit or harm, except what Allah has willed."¹

And:

قُلْ لَا أَمْلِكُ لِنَفْسِي ضَرًّا وَلَا نَفْعًا إِلَّا مَا شَاءَ اللَّهُ

Say, "I possess not for myself any harm or benefit except what Allah should will."²

And:

قُلْ لَا أَقُولُ لَكُمْ عِنْدِي خَزَائِنُ اللَّهِ وَلَا أَعْلَمُ الْغَيْبِ

Say, [O Muḥammad], "I do not tell you that I have the depositories [containing the provision] of Allah or that I know the unseen."³

1 Sūrah al-A'rāf: 188.

2 Sūrah Yūnus: 49.

3 Sūrah al-An'ām: 50.

And:

قُلْ سُبْحَانَ رَبِّيَ هَلْ كُنْتُ إِلَّا بَشَرًا رَسُولًا

Say, "Exalted is my Lord! Was I ever but a human messenger?"¹

And:

قُلْ إِنَّمَا أَنَا بَشَرٌ مِّثْلُكُمْ

Say, "I am only a man like you."²

This is the condition of the Messenger of guidance, the Seal of the Prophets, and the Master of the first and the last; then what would the condition of those inferior to him be?

Belief in the Last Day

Related to this fundamental belief they have many reprehensive views and many innovations. They have interpreted the verses of the Qur'ān pertaining to the hereafter with the *Raj'ah* (the return of 'Alī). This is a very cunning ploy which the fabricators have used in order to deny the Day of Judgement completely. The minimal effect that this would have upon the Shī'ah is that it would divert their hearts from that Day or at least eradicate therefrom the horrors thereof. This is due to the fact that they read every verse related to the Day of Judgment understanding it be regarding *Raj'ah* as is asserted by their scholars.

One of their innovations in this regard is that they aver that the affairs of the afterlife are under the jurisdiction of the Imāms. The author of *al-Kāfī* mentions:

1 Sūrah al-Isrā': 93.

2 Sūrah al-Kahf: 110.

الآخرة للإمام يضعها حيث يشاء و يدفعها إلي من يشاء جائز له ذلك من الله

The afterlife belongs to the Imām. He can place it wherever he desires and give it over to whomsoever he wishes. The permission for this is given to him by Allah.¹

Why does the Imām have full control of the afterlife? This is a subsidiary belief of their conception of Jannah and Jahannam. For they say:

لولا الأئمة ما خلقت الجنة و النار

If there were no Imāms Jannah and Jahannam would not have been created.²

And:

إن الله خلق الجنة من نور الحسين

Allah created Jannah from the light of Ḥusayn.³

Their scholar al-Baḥrānī has established a chapter related to this topic with the aforementioned as the title.⁴

At times they even assert that Jannah is the dowry of Fāṭimah عليها السلام which she received upon her marriage to ‘Alī عليه السلام.

I do not know how Jannah can be her dowry if it was created from the light of her son. For it is the default ruling of marriage that the dowry should be given in advance.

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/409.

2 Ibn Bābawayh says, “It is compulsory to believe that if it was not for them Allah would not have created the heavens, the earth, Jannah, Jahannam, Ādam, Ḥawwā’, the angels, or any of his other creations (*Al-I’tiqādāt* p. 106-107).

3 *Al-Ma’ālim al-Zulfā* p. 249; Hāshim al-Baḥrānī: *Nuzhat al-Abrār* p. 395.

4 *Al-Ma’ālim al-Zulfā* p. 395.

Al-Ṭūsī has narrated the following from Abū Baṣīr that Abū ‘Abd Allah al-Ṣādiq said:

إن الله تعالى أمهر فاطمة رضي الله عنها ربع الدنيا فربعها لها، وأمهرها الجنة و النار، تدخل أعداءها النار
و تدخل أولياءها الجنة

Allah ﷻ gave Fāṭimah a quarter of the world as dowry hence it belongs to her. He likewise gave her Jannah and Jahannam as part of her dowry. Her enemies will enter Jahannam and her partisans will enter Jannah.¹

The author of *Ma‘ālim al-Zulfā* has actually established a chapter with the title, *Chapter four regarding Jannah being in the dowry of Fāṭimah*,² i.e. being part of her dowry.

Furthermore, the Imāms enjoy the benefits of this dowry in the world, hence they say that the Imāms eat from the bounties of Jannah in this world. Al-Baḥrānī in establishing this aspect establishes a chapter by the name, *Chapter regarding no one having the honour of eating the food of Jannah in this world besides a Nabī and the successor of a Nabī*. In this chapter he cites various narrations from their reliable sources which suggest that the fruits, pomegranates, and trays of Jannah—which are laden with food—come down upon the Imāms from Jannah wherefrom they eat. All of this is presented in lengthy stories.

They, in their claim that only a Nabī or his successor is privileged with eating the food of Jannah, forgot to add ‘the daughter of a Nabī’ thereby depriving Fāṭimah of her dowry and from the bounties which were created from the light of her son. Because she admittedly is not from amongst the successors. Ostensibly, they did not include her, fearing that the daughters of the other Ambiyā’—who do not deserve any respect in the Shī‘ī dogma—would also be included.

1 Ibid p. 350

2 Ibid 317-319.

Due to the fact that the afterlife according to this denomination belongs to the Imāms in the ways mentioned above, they have tainted all the events of the afterlife with exaggerated tales regarding their Imāms. Hence, they say that the Imāms are present at the time of a person's death. Al-Majlisī, under the discussion of the beliefs of his sect mentions:

يجب الإقرار بحضور النبي والأئمة الإثني عشر صلوات الله عليهم عند موت الأبرار والفجار والمؤمنين والكفار، فينفعون المؤمنون بشفاعتهم في تسهيل غمرات الموت و سكراته عليهم، و يشددون علي المنافقين و مبغضي أهل البيت صلوات الله عليهم، ولا يجوز التفكير في كيفية ذلك إنهم يحضرون-كذا- في الأجساد الأصلية أو المثالية أو بغير ذلك

It is mandatory to believe that Nabī ﷺ and the Twelve Imāms are present at the departing moments of the pious, the impious, the believers, and the disbelievers. They thus help the believers in the pangs of death and its difficulties. And they intensify the agony of the hypocrites and the haters of the Ahl al-Bayt. It is not permissible to delve into the manner of their appearance; they either appear in their physical bodies or in abstract ones or without any of them.¹

And when the deceased is placed in the grave some sand from the grave of Ḥusayn is placed with him therein due to it being a source of security according to them. Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī has established a chapter titled, *Chapter regarding the desirability of putting the sand of Ḥusayn in the camphor, the winning sheet, and the grave*.² The author of *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* has likewise dedicated a chapter to this topic with the same title.³ Therein he mentions that one of the advices that they dispense in this regard is that the sand of the grave of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ should be placed with the deceased in his grave for it has been reported to be a source of safety.⁴ They have many other traditions in this regard.⁵

1 Al-I'tiqādāt p. 93-94.

2 Wasā'il al-Shi'ah 2/742.

3 Mustadrak al- Wasā'il 1/106.

4 Mustadrak al-Wasā'il 1/106.

5 Refer to the previous two references and: al-Ṭūsī: *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* 2/27; al-Ṭabarsī: *al-Ihtijāj* p. 274; al-Kaf'amī: *al-Miṣbāḥ* p. 511.

The assignment of Obligations, as they allege, the elevation of stages and the doing of good deeds all are possible for a deceased whilst he is in his grave. Al-Kulaynī in his *al-Kāfī* narrates the following from Ḥaḍḥ:

سمعت موسى بن جعفر يقول لرجل أياحب البقاء في الدنيا؟ قال نعم، فقال: ولم؟ قال: لقراءة قل هو الله أحد. فسكت عنه فقال له بعد ساعة: يا حفص من مات من أوليائنا وشيعتنا ولم يحسن القرآن علم في قبره ليرفع الله به من درجته، فإن درجات الجنة علي قدر آيات القرآن

I heard Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar asking a man, “Should a person love staying in this world?”

The man replied, “Yes.”

He asked him why and the man replied, “In order to recite Surah al-Ikhlāṣ.”

Thereafter Mūsā remained silent for a while and then said, “O Ḥaḍḥ! Whoever dies from amongst our friends and partisans without perfecting the recitation of the Qurʾān is inspired with its recitation in the grave so that Allah ﷻ raises his ranks. For the ranks of Jannah are proportionate to the amount of verses a person knows of the Qurʾān.”¹

This narration suggests that a Shīʿī is taught the Qurʾān in the grave which he continues to read thereby accruing rewards even after his death. This is yet another belief which is exclusive to them. Can this not be considered a ploy against the memorisation and the preservation of the Qurʾān because of it making people anticipate its acquisition in the grave?

Furthermore, the first question that a person will be asked in the grave is with regards to his love and veneration of the Twelve Imāms. They claim:

أول ما يسأل عنه العبد حبنا أهل البيت

The first question a servant will be asked is regarding his love for us the Ahl al-Bayt.²

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/606; *al-Maʿālim al-Zulfā* p. 133.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 27/79; *Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā* p. 222.

The angels will thus ask him:

من يعتقد من الأئمة واحدا بعد واحد، فإن لم يجب عن واحد منهم يضربانه بعمود من نار يمتلئ قبره
نارا إلى يوم القيامة

About each Imām that he believed in one after the other. If he does not respond regarding any one of them he will be beaten with a pillar of fire which will fill his grave with fire till the Day of Judgment.¹

However:

إذا كان في حياته معتقدا بهم فإنه يستطيع الرد علي أسئلتهم و يكون في رغد إلى يوم الحشر

If he believed in them whilst he was living he will easily be able to answer the questions of the angels due to which he will remain in comfort till the Day of Judgment.²

They also believe in a resurrection after death which no one else besides them concedes. Al-Majlisī says the following in his *I'tiqādāt*:

يحشر الله تعالى في زمن القائم أو قبيله جماعة من المؤمنين لتقر أعينهم برؤية أئمتهم ودولتهم، و جماعة
من الكافرين و المخالفين للانتقام عاجلا في الدنيا

In the era of the 'Mahdī' Allah ﷺ will resurrect a group of believers so that they may be blessed with the seeing of their Imāms and their rule. He will also resurrect a group of disbelievers and enemies in order to punish them in advance in this world.³

As for their belief regarding the actual resurrection which will ensue on the Day of Judgment, they have many eerie views. One of their narrations suggest that on

1 *Al-I'tiqādāt* p. 95.

2 Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī al-Jalālī: *al-Islām 'Aqīdah wa Dustūr* p. 77.

3 *Al-I'tiqādāt* p. 98.

the Day of Judgment the resurrection will not include everyone as is the belief of the Muslims. Instead there will be groups who will be saved from resurrection on that day and from its horrors. They will not have to stand for accountability before Allah, nor will they have to cross the bridge of *Ṣirāṭ*. They will enter Jannah from their graves directly.

This group is the people of Qum, as their narrations suggest:

إن أهل مدينة قم يحاسبون في حفرهم و يحشرون من حفرهم إلى الجنة

The people of Qum will be held accountable for their deeds in their graves and will be sent from their graves to Jannah directly.¹

Not only that, there is a door in Jannah which is reserved for the people of Qum as they allege. Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā says:

إن للجنة ثمانية أبواب، و لأهل قم واحد منها فطويبي لهم فطويبي

Verily Jannah has eight doors. One door from them will be exclusive to the people of Qum. How very fortunate are they.²

And:

وهم خيار شيعتنا من بين سائر البلاد خمر الله تعالى ولايتنا في طبيعتهم

They are the best of our partisans in all the cities. Allah has made allegiance to our household part of their nature.³

‘Abbās al-Qummī, one of their contemporary scholars, states:

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 60/ 218; ‘Abbās al-Qummī: *al-Kunā wa al-Alqāb* 3/71.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 60/215; *Safīnah al-Biḥār* 1/446.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 60/216.

وقد وردت روايات كثيرة عن أئمة أهل البيت في مدح قم وأهلها، وأنها فتحة إليها بابا-كذا-من أبواب الجنة

Many narrations have been narrated from the Ahl al-Bayt regarding the virtues of Qum and its people. One of them being that a door of Jannah has been opened for them.¹

They have mentioned many more exclusive merits which Qum enjoys.² They have gone to the extent of inducing people to purchase its land. They deceived them by telling them that the space of land covered by a horse is worth a thousand Dirhams.³ Hence they tried to influence the people spiritually and materialistically, and possibly there might be some political agenda as well behind the city, for Qum was the capital of Safawid Iran. Not forgetting the heinous habit this cult has to spread disbelief, free thinking, and distancing the Shī'ah from the dīn of Islām. It is very possible that they are assisted in doing so by the devils from amongst the Jinn which is nothing extraordinary. Because it is possible for them to appear in the garb of the 'hidden Mahdi' and include into their creed whatever they desire.

One of their contemporary scholars has increased the number of the doors of Jannah through which the people of Qum will be granted entry. He mentions that a report from al-Riḍā states the following:

للجنة ثمانية أبواب فتلاثة منها لأهل قم

Jannah has eight doors, three of them are reserved for the people of Qum.⁴

They have, furthermore, ascribed full authority over the bridge of Širāt, the scale of deeds, Jannah, and Jahannam to the Imāms. Abū 'Abd Allah is reported to have said:

1 *Al-Kunā wa al-Alqāb* 3/7.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 60/212-221.

3 *Ibid.* 60/215.

4 Muḥammad Mahdī al-Kāzīmī: *Aḥsan al-Wadī'ah* p. 313-314.

The issues of the *Şirāt*, the issues of the scale and the issues of accountability are all under our jurisdiction.¹

Al-Ḥur al-‘Āmilī has gone on to mention that part of their fundamental beliefs regarding the Imāms is that the accountability of the entire creation will be under their jurisdiction on the Day of Judgment.²

There are likewise many narrations which state that no one will be able to cross the bridge of *Şirāt* but if he was aligned to ‘Alī³ or due to a pass which will contain the mention of allegiance to him⁴ or with a letter wherein emancipation will be assured due to his allegiance.⁵

Ibn Bābawayh in his book *Al-I’tiqādāt* has mentioned the following under the chapter regarding the *Şirāt*:

و الصراط في وجه آخر اسم حجج الله قم نعرفهم في الدنيا وأطاعهم أعطاه الله جوازا علي الصراط الذي هو جسر جهنم يوم القيامة... قال النبي صلي الله عليه وسلم لعلي: يا علي إذا كان يوم القيامة أقعد انا و أنت و جبرائيل علي الصراط فلا بجوز علي الصراط إلا من كانت معه براءة بولايتك

The *Şirāt* in other terms is a name for the evidences of Allah, hence whoever acknowledged them in this world and obeyed them Allah will grant him the ability to cross over it on the Day of Judgment. Nabī ﷺ said to ‘Alī, “O ‘Alī on the Day of Judgement I with you and Jibrīl will sit upon the *Şirāt*. Hence besides the one who has the certificate of emancipation due to his allegiance to you, no one will be able to cross the *Şirāt*.”⁶

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 337.

2 *Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah fī Uṣūl al-A’immaḥ*; p. 171.

3 *Al-Ma’ālim al-Zulfā* p. 239.

4 *Bihār al-Anwār* 8/68; *al-Burhān* 4/17.

5 *Bihār al-Anwār* 8/66.

6 *Al-I’tiqādāt* p. 95.

He also states that there will be an incline by the bridge whose name is Wilāyah:

يوقف جميع الخلائق عندها فيسألون عن ولاية امير المؤمنين و الأئمة من بعده فمن أتى بها نجا و جاوز
و من لم يأت بها بقي

The entire creation will be stopped there and asked regarding their allegiance to ‘Alī; whoever concedes it will gain salvation and whoever does not will remain behind.¹

Al-Majlisī has established a chapter titled, *Chapter regarding him being a partner in Jannah, Jahannam, and in the crossing of the Bridge*.² Al-Baḥrānī has likewise established a similar chapter.³ They have in these chapters quoted the narrations of their leading scholars and reliable books.

The actual meaning of ‘Alī being a partner in Jannah and Jahannam is not shared but with the elite. This is because Ma’mūn (the Abbasid Ruler) once asked al-Riḍā about ‘Alī being a partner in Jannah and Jahannam to which he replied by saying that love for ‘Alī is īmān and hatred for him is disbelief making him thus a partner in them. But when Abū al-Ṣalt al-Harawī meets al-Riḍā and asks him:

إنما كلمت من حيث هو ولقد سمعت أبي يحدث عن علي رضي الله عنه أنه قال قال: قال لي رسول الله
صلي الله عليه وآله يا علي أنت قسيم الجنة و النار يوم القيامة تقول للنار هذا لي و هذا لك

I just responded to him according to his position. I heard my father narrating from his forefathers who narrate from ‘Alī that he said, “Rasūl Allāh ﷺ said to me, ‘O ‘Alī you are the one who will send people to Jannah and Jahannam; you will say to Jahannam, “This is for me and that is for you.”⁴

1 Ibid. p. 96.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 39/193.

3 *Al-Ma’ālim al-Zulfā* p. 167.

4 ‘Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā p. 239; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 39/194.

They also assert that he is the owner of Jannah and Jahannam. Their narrations mention:

إذا كان يوم القيامة وضع منبر يراه الخلاق يصعده رجل يقوم ملك من يمينه و ملك عن شماله، ينادي الذي عن يساره: يا معشر الخلاق هذا علي بن أبي طالب صاحب النار يدخلها النار

When the Day of Judgment will come a pulpit which the entire creation will be able to see will be placed. A man will ascend it, on his right will be an angel and on his left will be an angel. The one on his right will announce, "O creation this is 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib the owner of Jannah. He will admit therein whoever he desires." The one on his left will announce, "O creation! This is 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib the owner of Jahannam. He will enter therein whoever he desires."¹

They have, in addition, went on to believe that he will be the one responsible for taking people to task on the Day of Judgment. Mufaḍḍal ibn 'Umar al-Ju'fī states that he heard Abū 'Abd Allah saying:

إن أمير المؤمنين علي بن أبي طالب لديان الناس يوم القيامة

Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib will be the questioner of the people on the Day of Judgment.²

And this Jannah that the Shī'ah talk of is exclusive for them; no one will share it with them as it belongs to their Imāms. Likewise, the keys of Jahannam, which is in place for their enemies, are in the possession of the Imāms. They say:

إنما خلقت الجنة لأهل البيت والنار لمن عاداهم

Jannah has been created for the Ahl al-Bayt and Jahannam has been created for their enemies.³

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 39/200; *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* 122.

2 Refer to the above to references and: *Tafsīr al-Furāt* p. 13.

3 *Al-Ma'ālīm al-Zulfā* p. 251.

They at times surprisingly forget these narrations and assert the following:

الشيعة يدخلون الجنة قبل سائر الناس من الأمم بشمانين عاما

The Shī'ah will enter Jannah eighty years before the rest of the people.¹

The following belief is also part of their primary beliefs:

أن الناس يدعون بأسماء امهاتهم يوم القيامة إلا الشيعة فيدعون بأسماء آبائهم

The people will be summoned with their mothers' names on the Day of Judgment besides the Shī'ah, for they will be called with their fathers' names.²

Furthermore, they believe in a Jannah other than the everlasting Jannah of the hereafter which they name the Jannah of this world. Likewise in a Jahannam other than the Jahannam of the hereafter. Al-Majlisī says:

ويجب أن يعتقد أن لله تعالى في الدنيا جنة ونارا سوي جنة الخلد ونار الخلد

It is compulsory to believe that there exists in this world a heaven and hell different than the everlasting ones of the hereafter.³

Hence, the inmates of the grave go to them. According al-Majlisī:

بعد السؤال وضغطة القبر ينتقلون إلي أجسادهم المثالية فقد يكونون علي قبورهم ويطلعون علي زوارهم
وينتقلون إلي نجف

1 *Al-Ma'ālīm al-Zulfā* p. 255; Ibn Qulūyah: *Kāmil al-Ziyārāt* p. 137; al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī: *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 10/331.

2 *Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah fī Uṣūl al-A'imma* p. 124.

3 *Al-I'tiqādāt* p. 98: They say that this is the Jannah wherein Ādam عليه السلام was kept. Ibn Taymiyyah says, "According to the Ahl al-Sunnah unanimously the Jannah wherein Ādam عليه السلام and his wife were kept is the everlasting Jannah of the hereafter. Whoever claims that it was a Jannah in this world is either a philosopher, a heretic, or an innovator. For only they subscribe to this view." (*al-Fatāwā* 4/347).

After the questioning and the severe grip of the grave they will go into their abstract bodies. They will then both remain at their graves and see their visitors or they proceed to Najf.¹

Their claims related to this topic are too copious to be enumerated, excessive and reprehensible innovations, what I have cited is just a glimpse of what they believe. If I were to present all their narrations and comment upon them I would require many pages.

Nonetheless, these are all innovations which cannot be substantiated from the Qur'ān. Nor is there any mention of them or any trace of them in the books of Ummah. In exposing their duplicate nature and knowing the falsehood that is contained within them it is sufficient to merely present them. They have in essence made the hereafter the exclusive ownership of the Imāms. Whereas Allah ﷻ says:

فَلِلَّهِ الْآخِرَةُ وَالْأُولَى

Rather, to Allah belongs the Hereafter and the first [life].²

Their claims in this regard are very similar to the claims the Jews would make regarding the hereafter. Allah ﷻ says:

قُلْ إِنْ كَانَتْ لَكُمْ الدَّارُ الْآخِرَةُ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ خَالِصَةً مِّنْ دُونِ النَّاسِ فَتَمَنَّوْا الْمَوْتَ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ
وَلَنْ يَتَمَنَّوْهُ أَبَدًا بِمَا قَدَّمْت أَيْدِيهِمْ وَاللَّهُ عَلِيمٌ بِالظَّالِمِينَ

Say, "If the home of the Hereafter with Allah is for you alone and not the [other] people, then wish for death, if you should be truthful." But never will they wish for it, ever, because of what their hands have put forth. And Allah is knowing of the wrongdoers.³

1 *Al-I'tiqādāt* p. 97. I.e. Najf is Jannah.

2 Sūrah al-Najm: 25.

3 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 94-95.

They have similarly ascribed to the Imāms all jurisdiction on the Day of Judgement, whereas Allah ﷻ says:

لَهُ الْحَمْدُ فِي الْأُولَىٰ وَالْآخِرَةِ وَلَهُ الْحُكْمُ وَإِلَيْهِ تُرْجَعُونَ

To Him is [due all] praise in the first [life] and the Hereafter. And His is the [final] decision, and to Him you will be returned.¹

They also claim that Jannah belongs to the Imāms like the Jews:

وَقَالُوا لَنْ يَدْخُلَ الْجَنَّةَ إِلَّا مَنْ كَانَ هُودًا أَوْ نَصَارَىٰ تِلْكَ آمَانَتُهُمْ قُلْ هَاتُوا بُرْهَانَكُمْ إِن كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ بَلَىٰ مَنْ أَسْلَمَ وَجْهَهُ لِلَّهِ وَهُوَ مُحْسِنٌ فَلَهُ أَجْرُهُ عِنْدَ رَبِّهِ وَلَا خَوْفٌ عَلَيْهِمْ وَلَا هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ

And they said, “None will enter Paradise except one who is a Jew or a Christian.” That is [merely] their wishful thinking. Say, “Produce your proof, if you should be truthful.” Yes, [on the contrary], whoever submits his face [i.e. self] in Islam to Allah while being a doer of good will have his reward with his Lord. And no fear will there be concerning them, nor will they grieve.²

We say to the Shī'ah regarding the claims that have passed:

هَاتُوا بُرْهَانَكُمْ إِن كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ

Produce your proof, if you should be truthful.

Instead, you are humans like the rest of humanity. And your claims are weak, malicious and heretic. Before us is the Book of Allah which does not leave any way for these wild assumptions to enter the hearts of those who resort to it and make it their guide.

1 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 70.

2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 111-112.

As for the one whose heart is blocked, who becomes arrogant about his evil when it is brought to his notice and whose thoughts are blinded due to his fanaticism, he will face the consequences:

وَاتَّقُوا يَوْمًا لَا تَجْزِي نَفْسٌ عَنْ نَفْسٍ شَيْئًا وَلَا يُقْبَلُ مِنْهَا عَدْلٌ وَلَا تَنفَعُهَا شَفَاعَةٌ وَلَا هُمْ يُنصَرُونَ

And fear a Day when no soul will suffice for another soul at all, and no compensation will be accepted from it, nor will any intercession benefit it, nor will they be aided.¹

Their Belief in Pre-destiny

Ibn Taymiyyah states:

قدماء الشيعة كانوا متفقين علي إثبات القدر وإنما شاع فيهم نفي القدر من حين اتصلوا بالمعتزلة

The early Shī'ah unanimously believed in pre-destiny. The denial thereof only prevailed among them when they associated with the Mu'tazilah.²

This was during the latter portion of the third century. Its denial increased even more in the fourth century with the works of al-Mufid and his followers.³

All the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt likewise are reported to have unanimously believed in pre-destiny.⁴

Al-Ash'arī explains that the Shī'ah in terms of their belief regarding the actions of men are divided into three sects:

1. A sect that believes that the actions of men are created by Allah.

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 123.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/29.

3 Ibid. 1/229.

4 Ibid. 2/29.

2. A sect that believes that they are not his creation
3. A sect that has chosen the middle path, i.e. the stance that there is no coercion upon men in their actions (as al-Jahmī and others believed) nor is there complete free will (which is the view of the Mu‘tazilah).

This is, as they allege, what is narrated from the Imāms. This sect has, however, not taken up the task of clarifying its stance regarding the actions of men, are they created or not?¹

Ibn Taymiyyah has considered the last sect to be unsure in this regard whilst considering the first one to be positive and the second negative.²

The author of *Tuḥfah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah* has not mentioned anything much in this regard besides the fact that a servant according to the Shī‘ah creates his own actions.³

This is what the references of the Ahl al-Sunnah say. After accessing the books of the Shī‘ah the following is understood:

Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, who is known as al-Ṣadūq, documents the following is his ‘Aqā’id (which the Shī‘ah treat as a seminal work which represents their beliefs and is famous by the name: ‘Aqā’id al-Ṣadūq):

اعتقادنا في أفعال العباد أنها مخلوقة خلق تقدير لا خلق تكوين ومعني ذلك أنه لم يزل الله عالما بمقاديرها

Our belief regarding the actions of men is that they are created in pre-destiny, but not physically. Which means that Allah سبحانه وتعالى always had knowledge of them.⁴

1 *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/114, 115.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/386.

3 *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* p. 90.

4 ‘Aqā’id al-Ṣadūq p. 75.

This statement only establishes the knowledge of Allah about the actions of men. It does not establish his general and all-encompassing will and thus does not prove that he is the creator of the action of men. Moreover al-Mufid has followed this text with the following:

الصحيح عن آل محمد صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم أن أفعال العباد غير مخلوقة لله والذي ذكره أبو جعفر قد جاء به حديث غير معمول به ولا مرضي الإسناد، والأخبار الصحيحة بخلافه. وليس يعرف في لغة العرب أن العلم بالشيء هو خلق له

The correct view regarding the Ahl al-Bayt is that they believed that the actions of men are not created by Allah, and what is narrated from Abū ‘Abd Allah is discarded, has a flawed chain of transmission, and is opposed by many authentic narrations. Nowhere in the Arabic language does the word ‘knowledge’ appear in the meaning of creation.¹

He further states:

وقد روي عن أبي الحسن أنه سئل عن أفعال العباد فقليل له هل هي مخلوقة لله تعالى؟ فقال عليه السلام: لو كان خالقاً لها لما تبرأ منها وقد قال سبحانه: **أَنَّ اللَّهَ بَرِيءٌ مِّنَ الْمُشْرِكِينَ** **وَرَسُولُهُ** ولم يرد البراءة من خلق ذواتهم وإنما تبرأ من شركهم وقبائحهم

When Abū al-Ḥasan was asked about the actions of men being created by Allah **سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى** he responded by saying, “If he did created them he would not have exonerated himself from them whereas he has said, ‘Allah and His Messenger are free from the polytheists.’” Of course he does not intend exonerating himself from their creation, rather from their polytheism and evil.²

The outlandish nature of this substantiation which al-Mufid has ascribed to al-Riḍā is quite evident. For the exoneration of Allah **سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى** from the polytheists due to his dislike for their actions does not necessarily negate his all-encompassing ability to create. Allah **سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى** says:

1 Sharḥ ‘Aqā’id al-Ṣadūq p. 12.

2 Sharḥ ‘Aqā’id al-Ṣadūq p. 13.

وَلَوْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ مَا أَشْرَكُوا

But if Allah had willed, they would not have associated.¹

In addition, some of their narrations are in harmony with the truth and deny the aforementioned stance. Hence, they say:

ما خلا الله فهو مخلوق والله خالق كل شيء

Everything besides Allah is the creation and Allah is the creator of everything.²

Furthermore, although al-Mufīd is a proponent of the view that men are the creators of their own actions, however, he does not find the expression very pleasant. Hence he says:

أقول إن الخلق يفعلون ويحدثون ونخترعون ويصنعون ويكتسبون ولا أطلق القول عليهم بأنهم يخلقون ولا هم خالقون ولا أتعدى ذكر ذلك فيما ذكره الله تعالى ولا أتجاوز به مواضعه من القرآن وعلي هذا القول إجماع الإمامية والزيدية والبغداديين من المعتزلة وأكثر المرجئة وأصحاب الحديث

I say that the creation does, invents, innovates, makes and earns. I, however, do not assert that they create or that they are creators. And I do not digress from the expression Allah has used in the Qur'ān. The Imāmiyyah, Zaydiyyah, the Mu'tazilah of Baghdad, the Murji'ah and most of the followers of ḥadīth are unanimous in this regard. The Mu'tazilah of Baṣrah have defected from the majority by using the expression of creation for men.³

So he abides by the approach of the Qur'ān. Because the Qur'ān has called men 'doers' and 'agents' but not 'creators'. However, the aforementioned consensus

1 Al-An'ām: 107.

2 Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah p. 35.

3 Awā'il al-Maqālāt p. 25.

of the Shī'ah did not last due to some of their scholars adopting the view of the Mu'tazilah of Baṣrah and using the expression of creation.¹ And the nominal difference which existed between the Shī'ah and the Mu'tazilah of Baṣrah fell away due to the stances of some of their leading scholars.

Hence, al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī (d. 1104 A.H. the author of *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah*.) in discussing the principle beliefs of their Imāms establishes a chapter by the title, *Chapter regarding Allah سبحانه وتعالى being the creator of everything besides the actions of men*.² Therein he says:

أقول مذهب الإمامية والمعتزلة أن أفعال العباد صادرة عنهم وهم خالقون لها

I say that the stance of the Imāmiyyah and the Mu'tazilah is that the actions of men emit from them and they are the creators thereof.³

1 They say that once Abū al-Ḥasan was asked, "Is there any other creator besides Allah, the Magnificent?" He replied by saying, "Allah says, 'Blessed is Allah, the Best of Creators.'" (Al-Mu'minūn: 14). Hence, amongst his servants there are creators and those who do not create; one among them is ʿĪsā عليه السلام who could create from soil a bird. (*al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah* p. 81).

This type of interpretation is attributed to some of the early scholars as well. Hence Ibn Jurayj is reported to have said, "Allah سبحانه وتعالى said 'creators', in its plural form, because ʿĪsā عليه السلام could also create as he said, "I create for you from soil..." Allah سبحانه وتعالى therefore informs us regarding Himself that He is the Best of Creators (*Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 12/11; *Tafsīr al-Baghawī* 3/304). But ʿĪsā عليه السلام did not create by himself but with the permission of Allah. Hence there is no supreme creator with Allah. Therefore the scholars have mentioned, "Creation in the verse means destining as the Arabic language suggests. Or as Mujāhid has said, "They make and Allah makes and Allah is the Best of Makers (*Tafsīr al-Baghawī* 3/304). After citing the statements of both Ibn Jurayj and Mujāhid, Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī concludes thus, "The statement of Mujāhid is closer to the truth because the Arabs call every maker a creator (*Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 12/11). The issue of the Shī'ah is not only in the use of an expression which has a meaning other than creation; but in their stance that a person creates his actions by himself. Likewise, the interpretation of their Imām that ʿĪsā عليه السلام creates is no evidence due to it not being true for every person. Because that was a miracle which would transpire with the permission of Allah سبحانه وتعالى. Furthermore, he explicitly told the people, "I create for you." Whereas the Shī'ah generalise his statement and omit the 'you'...

2 *Al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah* p. 80.

3 Ibid. p. 81.

Similarly, al-Ṭabaṭabā'ī says:

ذهبت الإمامية والمعتزلة إلي أن أفعال العباد وحركاتهم واقعة بقدرتهم واختيارهم فهم خالقون لها وما في الآيات من أنه تعالى خالق كل شيء وأمثالها إما مخصص بما سوي أفعال العباد أو مؤول بأن المعني أنه خالق كل شيء إما بلا واسطة أو بواسطة مخلوقاته

The Imāmiyyah and the Mu'tazilah are of the view that the doings of men and their movements all happen with their free will and they are the creators of them. Those verses which assert that Allah ﷻ is the creator of everything are specific and the actions of men are excluded therefrom. Or the interpretation thereof is that He is the creator of everything either directly or indirectly through the medium of His various creations.¹

Al-Qazwīnī likewise says:

وأفعال العباد مخلوقة لهم

The actions of men are from their creation.²

Many other scholars besides the aforementioned also hold the same view.³

As you can see, this is the exact stance of the Mu'tazilah. So did the Mu'tazilī stance influence the Shī'ī dogma or was this their stance from the beginning; the stance of their antecedent scholars and those who succeeded them?

1 Muḥammad Ṣādiq al-Ṭabṭabā'ī: *Majālis al-Muwaḥḥidīn fī Uṣūl al-Dīn* p. 21.

2 *Qalā'id al-Kharā'id* p. 60.

3 Like Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī in his book *Nahj al-Mustarshidīn* p. 52: he says, "The forth discussion: Regarding the creation of actions. Therein he asserts that this is the stance of his sect and the stance of the Mu'tazilah. He asserts the same in the eleventh chapter of his book. Likewise in his book *Kashf al-Murād* p. 332. Al-Majlisī has confirmed the same in his *Biḥār*; he says, "The Imāmiyyah and the Mu'tazilah are of the view that the doings of men and their movements all happen with their free will and they are the creators of them (*Biḥār al-Anwār* 4/148). Al-Miqdād al-Ḥillī also confirms the same. (See: *al-Nāfi' Yawm al-Ḥaṣhr fī Sharḥ al-Bāb al-Hādī 'Ashar* p. 32-33).

The best reference to ascertain this would be the ḥadīth literature of the Shī'ah. I resorted to the 'reliable' ḥadīth books of the Shī'ah, specifically to the seminal and classical works among them. What I discovered is that their narrations oppose the dominant view in the Shī'ī dogma, i.e. the view of the Mu'tazilah regarding the creation of the action of men; they also defy what a group of their scholars have averred in this regard (as was mentioned previously with reference to al-Mufīd, Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī, and others).

Hence one of their narrations mention:

قال أبو جعفر وأبو عبد الله إن الله أرحم بخلقهم من أن يجبر خلقه على الذنوب، ثم يعذبهم عليها، والله اعز من أن يريد أمراً فلا يكون قال: فستلا عليهما السلام هل بين الجبر والقدر منزلة ثالثة؟ قال نعم أوسع ما بين السماء والأرض.

Abū Ja'far and Abū 'Abd Allah said, "Allah ﷻ is too merciful to His servants to coerce them into sinning and to subsequently punish them upon them. And His might does not permit that He intend something and it does not happen."

They both were then asked, "Is there a stance between *Jabr* (coercion) and *Qadr* (free will)?"

He said, "Yes a position which is vaster than what is between the heavens and the earth."¹

I.e. between *Jabr* and *Qadr* there is third stance which is moderate.

A fair amount of their narrations state that their stance regarding pre-destiny is a moderate one; no *Jabr* (coercion) and no *Tafwīḍ* (grant of complete capacity and free will).²

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/159.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/155: chapter regarding *Jabr*, *Qadr* and the moderate position; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 5/22, 56; *al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah* p. 72.

Al-Majlisī, therefore, says:

اعلم أن الذي استفاض عن الأئمة هو نفي الجبر والتفويض وإثبات أمر بين أمرين

Know well that the common view of the Imāms is the denial of Jabr and Tafwīḍ and the affirmation of the moderate stance between the two of them.¹

The denial of *Jabr* is clear. It is the renunciation of the stance of the *Jabariyyah* (those who believe that humans are puppets with no free will). However, what do they mean by the denial of *Tafwīḍ*?

Al-Majlisī says:

أما التفويض فهو ما ذهب إليه المعتزلة من أنه تعالى أوجد العباد، وأقدرهم علي تلك الأفعال وفوض إليهم الاختيار فهم مستقلون بإيجادها وفق مشيئتهم وقدرتهم وليس لله في أفعالهم صنع

Tafwīḍ is the stance of the Mu'tazilah, which is to say that Allah ﷻ created men and enabled them to do actions and gave them free will. Hence they create their actions independently according to their will and Allah has no say in the actions.²

Similarly, they have many other narrations which condemn the stance of the Mu'tazilah and criticize the proponents thereof. Hence these narrations are a refutation of the Shī'ah themselves. In *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, their Imām is reported to have condemned the Mu'tazilah and their likes for their denial of pre-destiny. He says:

القدرية الذين يقولون لا قدر يزعمون أنهم قادرون علي الهدى والضلالة وذلك أنهم إذا شاؤوا اهتدوا و أن شاؤوا ضلوا وهم مجوس هذه الأمة وكذب أعداء الله المشيئة والقدرة لله كما بدأكُم تَعُوذُونَ فَرِيقًا هَدَى وَفَرِيقًا حَقَّ عَلَيْهِمُ الضَّلَالَةُ من خلقه الله شقيًا يوم خلقه كذلك يعود إليه شقيًا ومن خلقه سعيدًا يوم

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 5/82.

2 *Ibid.* 5/83.

خلقه كذلك يعود إليه سعيدا. قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله الشقي من شقي في بطن أمه والسعيد من سعد في بطن أمه

The Qadariyyah who deny pre-destiny claim that they are capable of guidance and misguidance; meaning: if they want they can choose guidance and if they want they can choose misguidance. They are the Zoroastrians of this Ummah; they have denied executive will and authority for Allah whereas He says, “A group he guided and a group deserved error.”¹ Whoever Allah created wretched will return to him wretched and whoever he created fortunate will return to him fortunate. Rasūl Allah ﷺ said, “Wretched is the one who became wretched in the womb of his mother, and fortunate is the one who became fortunate in the womb of his mother.”²

Abū ‘Abd Allah is likewise reported to have said:

إنك لتستل عن كلام أهل القدر وما هو من ديني ولا دين آبائي ولا وجدت أحدا من أهل بيتي يقول به

You are asking me about the deniers of pre-destiny whereas that is not my creed nor the creed of my fore-fathers and nor have I known any supporter thereof in my family.³

He has also said:

ويح هذه القدرية أما يقرأون هذه الآية إِلَّا أَمْرًا تَقْدَرُهَا مِنَ الْغَابِرِينَ ويحهم من قدرها إلا الله تبارك وتعالى.

Woe be to the Qadariyyah! Do they not read this verse, “Except his wife. We have decreed that she is of those who remain behind.” Woe be to them! Who ordained that besides Allah?⁴

1 Sūrah al-A‘rāf: 29-30.

2 Tafsīr al-Qummī 1/226-227; Biḥār al-Anwār 5/9.

3 Biḥār al-Anwār 5/56.

4 Biḥār al-Anwār 5/56.

There are many other narrations as well.¹

All of these narrations inform us of the stance of the Ahl al-Bayt, which is the affirmation of pre-destiny; they also randomly tell us of the stance of the early Shī'ah. The later Shī'ah have nonetheless diverted from these narrations without any evidence besides blindly following the Mu'tazilah; they turned a blind eye to all the narrations which oppose their stance. Instead they have included the concept of 'Adl (the obligation of justice upon Allah) as part of their fundamental beliefs just like the Mu'tazilah. Although outwardly this sounds very nice but in reality it implies a very grave result which is the denial of pre-destiny.

One of their scholars says:

أما الإمامية فالعدل من أركان الإيمان عندهم بل ومن أصول الإسلام

As for the Imāmiyyah 'Adl is one the fundamentals of īmān according to them, rather it is a principle aspect of Islam.²

In spite of the statements of the Imāms, as documented in their canonical works, not clearly denying pre-destiny mostly, and refuting the Mu'tazilah in their denial thereof, as many of their narrations establish that the truth is not with the Mu'tazilah and the deniers of pre-destiny, nor with the Jabariyyah (who aver that humans are puppets who have no free will), and asserting that it is in a third position which is moderate between the two. But what exactly is this moderate position?

Some of their narrations appear rather hesitant in expounding upon this and seem satisfied with just making the vague statement mentioned above. Hence, when Abū 'Abd Allah was asked regarding the meaning thereof he did not answer. The narrations suggest the following regarding his stance:

1 See *Biḥār al-Anwār* 5/116: narrations: 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 69, etc.

2 Hāshim Ma'rūf: *al-Shī'ah bayn al-Ashā'irah wa al-Mu'tazilah* p. 240; 'Abd al-Amīr Qabalān: *'Aqīdah al-Mu'min* p. 43.

فقلب يده مرتين أو ثلاثا ثم قال: لو أجبتك فيه لكفرت

He turned his hand two or three times and then said, “If I give you any answer in this issue you will disbelieve.”¹

Some of their scholars have interpreted this response of Abū ‘Abd Allah as *Taqiyyah*. For he concealed the right answer because he knew that the understanding of the questioner would not be able to grasp it correctly due to which he would engage in disbelief.²

It is very possible that this indefinite stance is the third stance of the Shī‘ah in general, as asserted by al-Ash‘arī. The first stance as articulated by al-Mufīd is that the actions of men are not the creation of Allah.³ The view of al-Ash‘arī is qualified as you have read and understood in the narrations presented above. Hence, the Twelver tradition is comprehensive of all three views presented by al-Ash‘arī in his *Maqālāt* as the views of the Shī‘ah in general.

Al-Ṣadūq in his *‘Aqā’id* has mentioned a narration which explains the moderate stance. The narrations states:

قيل لأبي عبد الله ما أمر بين الأمرين فقال ذلك مثل رجل رأيته علي المعصية فنهيته فلم ينته فتركته ففعل
تلك المعصية فليس حيث لا يقتل منك فتركته كنت أنت الذي أمرته بالمعصية

Abū ‘Abd Allah was asked, “What is the stance between the two stances?”

He said, “It is like a man who you see indulging in sin, you prevent him but he does not desist consequent to which you leave him. Hence if you leave him is his condition on the basis of his refusal it will be as though you ordered him to do the sin.”⁴

1 Ibn Bābawayh: *al-Tawhīd* p. 363; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 5/53. Another narration appears wherein he says that it is one of the secrets of Allah (*Biḥār al-Anwār* 5/116) or that the middle stance is that which is between the heavens and the earth (*Ibid.* 5/116)

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 5/53-54.

3 *Sharḥ ‘Aqā’id al-Ṣadūq* p. 10-12.

4 *‘Aqā’id al-Ṣadūq* p. 75.

In this narration he explains pre-destiny as enjoining good and prohibiting evil, which is not enough in stating the correct stance, because it implies that Allah has no authority over men with the exception of His orders and prohibitions.

We, however, find a scholar of theirs who has interpreted this stance in accordance with the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah with the aid of those narrations from their tradition which affirm pre-destiny. Hence, after making mention of the deviance of the Jabariyyah in the stance that they have taken and averring that they have attributed oppression to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and after mentioning the stance of the Qadariyyah in the stance that they have taken and averring that they have ascribed partners to Allah in his quality of creation he says:

واعتقادنا في ذلك تبع لما جاء عن أئمتنا الأطهار عليهم السلام من الأمر بين الأمرين والطريق الوسط بين القولين فقد قال أمامنا عليه السلام لبينا الطريق الوسط كلمته المشهورة لا جبر ولا تفويض ولكن أمر بين الأمرين. ما أجمل هذا المعنى وما أدق معناه وخلاصته إن أفعالنا حقيقة ونحن أسبابها الطبيعية وهي تحت قدرتنا واختيارنا من جهة أخرى هي مقدورة لله تعالى وداخله في سلطانه لأنه هو مفيض الوجود ومعطيه. فلم يجبرنا علي أفعالنا حتي يكون قد ظلمنا علي المعاصي لأن لنا القدرة والاختيار فيما نفعل ولم يفوض إلينا خلق أفعالنا حتي يكون قد أخرجها عن سلطانه بل له الخلق والأمر وهو قادر علي كل شيء ومحيط بالعباد.

Our belief in this regard is subject to what has been proven from our pure A'imma, i.e. the moderate stance which avoids both extremes. For our Imām al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام in affirming the moderate stance has said, “No Jabr and no Tafwīḍ but between the two of them.” How brilliant is this statement and how profound is its meaning and essence: our deeds in terms of them being our deeds are a reality and we are the natural causes of their occurrence; they are subject to our capacity and free will. And when analysed differently they are destined by Allah and are under his jurisdiction because He is the initiator of existence and the giver thereof. So He has not coerced us to do our actions thereby oppressing us into his disobedience, because he has given us ability and free will in what we do. Nor has he given us the ability to create our actions thereby removing us from His supreme dominion. To Him belongs creation and order; He is capable of everything and is fully aware of His servants.¹

1 Al-Muẓaffar: 'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah p. 67-68. A similar stance is taken by al-Zanjānī in his book: 'Aqā'id al-Shī'ah al-Imāmiyyah al-Ithnay 'Ashariyyah 3/175-176.

This text does not oppose the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding the actions of men. It tells us that among the later Shī'ah there are still some who have held on to the stance of the antecedent scholars and to the dictates of many of their narrations. This is of course if we do not doubt him of euphemistically employing some sort of interpretation or some type of dissimulation. The knowledge of that is only by Allah.

But this still does not debunk the fact that the leading scholars of the Shī'ī dogma have taken the stance of the Mu'tazilah.

We can say possibly that in the antecedent times the affirmation of pre-destiny was the primary belief and the negation thereof is the result of later influence by the Mu'tazilī dogma. Hence the later scholars are mostly deniers even though a handful of them are still affirmers.

Lastly, there is no doubt as to the fact that the deniers have conveniently taken some proofs and discarded the others. Likewise is the case of Jabariyyah who have taken the other side of the evidence and discarded the rest. As for those who have treaded the middle path, they have comprehensively taken all of them. The verses of the Qur'ān establish ability, free will and action for men but all under the jurisdiction and will of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. He says:

وَمَا تَشَاءُونَ إِلَّا أَنْ يَشَاءَ اللَّهُ

And you do not will except that Allah wills.¹

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

The majority of the Ahl al-Sunnah, from the antecedent times to those who succeeded them, all aver that man has ability, free will and doing and that Allah is the creator of everything as is suggested by the Qur'ān and the Sunnah.

1 Sūrah al-Insān: 30; Sūrah al-Takwīr: 29.

He then lists all the proofs in this regard.¹

The copious narrations of the Shī'ah, some of which has passed in the previous pages, are the strongest evidence from their dogma itself for the falsity of the stance of the Mu'tazilah which their scholars have opted to adopt.²

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/20-21.

2 For more detail regarding pre-destiny and the refutation of the doubts of the Mu'tazilah and the Shī'ah refer to: *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 1/39-45, 285, 356, onwards; 20/2 and onwards; *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* vol. 8, and vol. 36/143-153; *Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah* p. 217 onwards, 347-352; 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Maḥmūd: *al-Qaḍā' wa al-Qadr*.

Section Three

This section contains eight chapters:

1. *Imāmāh.*
2. *‘Ismāh*
3. *Taqiyyah.*
4. *Ghaybah* and the Hidden Mahdī
5. *Raj‘ah.*
6. *Ẓuhūr*
7. *Badā’*
8. *Ṭīnah.*

Chapter One

Imāmāh

Imāmāh is the basis of the Shī‘ī dogma around which their ḥadīth legacy is based and upon which the edifice of their beliefs rests.

The Shī‘ah in ancient times and in recent times have paid immense attention to it.

In the pages to come I will present some of the crucial aspects thereof, Namely: The concept of Imāmāh, its inception, its rank in the Shī‘ī dogma, the initial concealment thereof by the Shī‘ah then the subsequent substantiations for it by their scholars, an exposition of their strongest proofs in favour of it and their analyses, a discussion regarding their *Takfīr* (ex-communication) of the one who denies it (to the extent that they have excommunicated the Ṣaḥābah, the Ahl al-Bayt, the Muslim rulers, judges, all the Muslim metropolises, and the different denominations that reside in them).

This will all become evident from their own ‘reliable’ sources in the pages to come.

The concept of Imāmah according to the Shī'ah and its inception:

Perhaps the first person to propound the concept of Imāmah¹ as it stands today in the Shī'ī dogma was Ibn Saba', who began propagating the idea that Imāmah by definition is the successorship of a Nabī which is exclusive to an appointed successor. If anyone besides him presides over it, then it will be compulsory to disassociate from him and dub him a disbeliever. The books of the Shī'ah concede the aforementioned:

كان أول من أشهر القول بفرض إمامة علي، وأظهر البراءة من أعدائه، وكاشف مخالفه وكفرهم

He was the first to popularize the view of the incumbency of the rulership of 'Alī, the first to disassociate with his enemies and expose them by dubbing them infidels.²

The underlying reason for this was that he was a Jew who believed that Yusha' ibn Nūn was the successor of Mūsā عليه السلام. Hence after embracing Islām he expressed the same view regarding 'Alī رضي الله عنه.³

Imāmah is the unanimous doctrine of the Shī'ah. Hence Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, when documenting the beliefs of the Shī'ah in the fourth century, states:

يعتقدون بأن لكل نبي وصي أو وصي إليه بأمر الله تعالى

They belief that every Nabī has a successor who he has appointed at the behest of Allah سبحانه وتعالى.⁴

1 Imāmah literally means leadership and an Imām is any person who people follow, whether they be upon the straight path or astray. The word Imām is also used in the meaning of *Khalīfah* (successor), a scholar who has a followership, and a person who leads a congregation in ṣalāh (See: *al-Lisān*, *Al-Qāmūs*, and *al-Miṣbāḥ* under the root letters أ م). Also see the definition of Imāmah according to the Ahl al-Sunnah in: *al-Māwardī: al-Aḥkām al-Sulṭāniyyah* p. 5; *Muqaddamah Ibn Khaldūn* 2/516-518).

2 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 108-109; *al-Qummī: Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq*: p. 20; *al-Nawbakhtī: Firaq al-Shī'ah* p. 22; *al-Rāzī: al-Zīnah* p. 305. Also refer to: *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal*: 1/174. *Al-Shahrastānī* therein says that Ibn Saba' was the first to express the idea of the divine appointment of 'Alī رضي الله عنه.

3 All the previously cited references.

4 'Aqā'id al-Ṣadūq p. 106.

He also mentions that the total amount of successors were a hundred and twenty thousand.¹ While al-Majlisī asserts that ‘Alī was the last among them.’²

Some of the chapters in *al-Kāfī* read as follows:

Chapter regarding Imāmah being the command of Allah from one person to the next.³

Chapter regarding Allah and his Rasūl appointing the Imāms one after the other.⁴

In these chapters al-Kulaynī has cited a significant amount of their indubitable narrations. Miqdād al-Ḥillī (d. 821 A.H.), therefore, states:

يكون شخصا معهودا من الله تعالى ورسوله لا أي شخص اتفق

The Imām has to be a person appointed by Allah and his Rasūl, not just any random person.⁵

Muḥammad Husayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’, one of the contemporary leading *Marāji’* (scholars) of the Shī’ah, states:

أن الإمامة منصب إلهي كالنبوة، فكما أن الله سبحانه يختار من يشاء من عباده للنبوة و الرسالة و يؤيد بالمعجزة التي هي كنص من الله عليه... فكذلك يختار للإمامة من يشاء و يأمر نبيه بالنص عليه و أن ينصبه إماما للناس من بعده

Imāmah is a divine station just like Nubuwwah. Just as Allah chooses whomsoever He wants to from his servants for Nubuwwah and Risālah,

1 Ibid.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 39/342. This means that there is no successor to come after ‘Alī which necessarily means that the Imāmah of those who succeeded him is invalid thereby rendering the Twelver Dogma invalid.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/227.

4 Ibid. 1/286.

5 *Al-Nāfi’ Yawm al-Ḥaṣhr* p. 47.

and aids him with miracles which serve as the proof for his legitimate appointment... similarly for Imāmah too, He selects whomsoever He wishes and orders his Nabī to emphatically appoint him and make him the leader of the masses after him.¹

As you can discern, the concept of Imāmah according to them is akin to that of Nubuwwah. Hence, just as Allah ﷻ chooses Ambiyā' from among his creation, he chooses Imāms. He emphatically appoints them, informs the creation about them, and establishes his evidence by means of them, aids them with miracles, reveals books to them, and sends revelation to them; thereby making them not speak or practice but in accordance with commandments of Allah and His revelation. In other words, Imāmah is Nubuwwah itself and the Imām is a Nabī, the difference in them is but nominal. Al-Majlisī therefore says:

إن استنباط الفرق بين النبي و الإمام من تلك الأخبار لا يخلو من إشكال

Establishing a difference between a Nabī and an Imām from these narrations is not free from objection.²

He further says:

ولا نعرف جهة لعدم اتصافهم بالنبوة إلا رعاية خاتم الأنبياء، ولا يصل عقولنا فرق بين النبوة و الإمامة

We do not know any reason for them not being privileged with Nubuwwah besides the consideration of the Seal of Nubuwwah. Our minds cannot fathom the difference between Nubuwwah and Imāmah.³

This is their conception of Imāmah. In its refutation it is sufficient to note that they have no evidence to substantiate it besides Ibn Saba' and the Jews.

1 *Aṣl al-Shī'ah wa Uṣūluhā* p. 58.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 26/82.

3 *Ibid.*

The position of Imāmah according to them

The issue of Imāmah, according to the Ahl al-Sunnah, is not an integral component of dīn wherein ignorance is intolerable, as has been asserted by the people of knowledge.¹ According to the Shī'ah, however, based on its Saba'ī conception it has a totally different standing all together. Hence, al-Nawbakhtī mentions that according to some sects of the Shī'ah Imāmah holds the loftiest position after Nubuwwah.² According to Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā' it is a divine station just like Nubuwwah,³ whilst according to some traditions of *al-Kāfī* it is a station higher than Nubuwwah.⁴ This last view has been backed by many of their scholars; Ni'mat Allah al-Jazā'irī mentions:

الإمامة العامة التي هي فوق درجة النبوة والرسالة

Imāmah is a position higher than Nubuwwah and the vicegerency of Allah.⁵

Hādī al-Ṭahrānī, one of their acclaimed scholars in recent times, likewise states:

الإمامة أجل من النبوة، فإنها مرتبة ثالثة شرف الله تعالى بها إبراهيم بعد النبوة و الخلة

Imāmah is loftier than Nubuwwah, for it is a third position with which Allah ﷻ honoured Ibrāhīm ﷺ after Nubuwwah and friendship.⁶

Furthermore, in *al-Kāfī* there are many narrations which suggest that Imāmah is the greatest principle of dīn. Al-Kulaynī narrates the following from Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ṣādiq:

1 Al-Āmidī: *Ghāyat al-Marām* p. 363; al-Ghazālī: *al-Iqtisād* p. 134; *Muqaddamah Ibn Khaldūn* 3/1080.

2 *Firaq al-Shī'ah* p. 19.

3 *Aṣḥ al-Shī'ah* p. 58

4 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/175.

5 *Zahr al-Rabī* p. 12.

6 *Wadāyī' al-Nubuwwah* p. 114.

بني الإسلام علي خمس علي الصلاة و الزكاة و الصوم و الحج و الولاية، ولم يناد بشيء كما نودي بالولاية، فأخذ الناس الأربع وتركوا هذه-يعني الولاية

Islām is based upon five pillars: Ṣalāh, Zakāh, Ṣawm, Ḥajj and Wilāyah. Nothing was emphasised like Wilāyah. The People subsequently latched onto the first four and abandoned Wilāyah.¹

As you can see, they have discarded the *Shahādātān* (the two testimonies of faith) from the fundamentals of Islām after replacing it with Wilāyah, as is clear from the statement, “and nothing was emphasised like Wilāyah,” and as is understood from another narration of theirs wherein the following addition features:

قلت (الراوي) و أي شيء من ذلك أفضل؟ فقال:الولاية أفضل

I said (i.e. the narrator), “Which of them is the best?”

He said, “Wilāyah is the best.”²

There is yet a narration similar to the first narration with the addition:

فرخص لهم في أشياء من الفرائض الأربع ولم يرخص لأحد من المسلمين في ترك ولايتنا، لا والله ما فيها رخصة

Concessions have been given for the first four fundamentals³ but no Muslim is given any concession to decline our allegiance. No, by Allah! There is no concession therein.⁴

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*: Kitāb al-Īmān wa al-Kufr, chapter regarding the fundamentals of Īmān, 2/18. This ḥadīth has been classed reliable and given the status of a reliable ḥadīth. Hence it is an acceptable narration according to their standards (See: *al-Shāfiʿi Sharḥ al-Kāfi* 5/28).

2 Ibid. this narration has an authentic chain of transmission, as attested to by their scholars (see: *al-Shāfiʿi* 5/59). This narration also appears in *Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī* 1/191, *al-Burhān* 1/303 and *Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/394.

3 Al-Majlisī says, “E.g. shortening the ṣalāh on journey, not fasting when on journey or after taking ill and the concession of not discharging zakāh, and not performing Ḥajj when not having the means. (*Mirʾāt al-ʿUqūl* 4/369).

4 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 2/22. Al-Majlisī rates the ḥadīth as authentic (according to their standards of course). See *Mirʾāt al-ʿUqūl* 4/369.

Their narrations have went on to mention that:

عرج بالنبي صلى الله عليه وآله السماء مائة وعشرين مرة، ما من مرة إلا وقد أوصي الله عز وجل فيها إلى النبي بالولاية لعلي والأئمة من بعده أكثر مما أوصاه بالفرائض

Nabī ﷺ was made to ascend the heavens a hundred and twenty times. At each time Allah ﷻ ordered him to pledge his allegiance to ‘Alī and the subsequent Imāms; more than the orders he issued to him regarding the other *Farā'id* (mandatory acts).¹

And:

وما وكد علي العباد في شيء ما وكد عليهم بالإقرار بالإمامة، وما جحد العباد شيئاً ما جحدوها
Allah ﷻ has not pressed upon his servants regarding any injunction more than he has pressed upon them regarding the acknowledgement of Imāmah. They would thus not deny anything more magnanimous than it.²

We find their contemporary scholars also affirming such deviance. Hence one of them says:

إن أعظم ما بعث الله تعالى نبيه من الدين إنما هو أمر الإمامة
The greatest aspect of dīn with which Allah ﷻ sent his Nabī ﷺ is Imāmah.³

This is the status of the Imāmah of the twelve Imāms according to them. I do not know what the evidence for this alleged superficial position is? Whereas the greatest constitution of Islam—the Qur’ān—time and again repeats the fundamentals of Islam, viz. the testimonies of faith, Ṣalāh, Ṣawm, Zakāh and Ḥajj. But does not make mention anywhere of the allegiance of their Imāms...

1 Ibn Bābawayh: *al-Khiṣāl* p. 600-601; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 23/69.

2 Al-Ḥimyarī: *Qurb al-Isnād* p.123; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 23/69.

3 Hādī al-Ṭahrānī: *Wadāyī’ al-Nubuwwah* p. 115; Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’: *Risālah ‘Ayn al-Mizān* p. 4

The secrecy of this doctrine

The doctrine of Imāmah, based on its Shī'ī conception, thus necessarily required that there be a very surreptitious movement which would invent this doctrine in order to destroy the Muslim empire. Hence when during the *Khilāfah Rāshidah* (the righteous reign) it first surfaced, Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī عليه السلام took a very stern stance against it. He thus banished 'Abd Allah ibn Saba' to Madā'in and refuted all the claims that he had tried to spread in the Muslim society, as is attested to by the books of the Shī'ah themselves.¹

This surreptitious movement then again went into complete secrecy. Hence, in the time of 'Alī al-Riḍā, falsely attributing their agenda to him, they would say:

ولاية الله أسرها إلي جبرئيل، وأسرها جبرائيل إلي محمد، وأسرها محمد إلي علي، وأسرها علي إلي من شاء الله، ثم أنتم تذيعون ذلك، من الذي أمسك حرفا سمعه؟

It is the Wilāyah of Allah regarding which he secretively informed Jibrīl, Jibrīl secretively informed Muḥammad, and Muḥammad secretively informed 'Alī. 'Alī, then secretively informed whoever he intended. Do you then disclose it? Who is the one who is able to hold back that which he has heard?²

Abū Ja'far al-Bāqir is reported to have said:

في حكمة آل داود ينبغي للمسلم أن يكون مالكا لنفسه مقبلا علي شأنه عارفا بأهل زمانه، فاتقوا الله، ولا تذيعوا حديثنا

One of the wisdoms of Dāwūd عليه السلام was: It is behoving of a Muslim to take control of himself, pay attention to his affairs, and know the people of his time. Therefore, fear Allah and do not spread our matter.³

1 Al-Qummī: *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 20; al-Nawbakhtī: *Firaq al-Shī'ah* p. 22-23. In *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 107. It is mentioned that 'Alī executed him.

2 Al-Māzindarānī: *Sharḥ al-Jāmi'* 9/123.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 2/224.

The aforementioned texts suggest that from the time of its revelation from Allah ﷻ Wilāyah has remained a secret belief. Which is why it was not permissible to talk about it. This implies that in the golden era of Islam there was no trace of Wilāyah. The commentator of *al-Kāfī* whilst explaining the reason for this says:

لما كانت التقية شديدة في عصرهم عليه السلام أمروا شيعتهم بكتمان أسرارهم وإمامتهم وأحاديثهم و
أحكامهم المختصة بمذهبهم

Due to Taqiyyah being very difficult in their times, the Imāms ordered their followers to conceal their secrets, Imāmah, traditions, and rulings which were specific to their creed.¹

Al-Kulaynī in one of his narrations mentions:

ولا تبشوا سرنا، ولا تضيعوا أمرنا

Do not divulge our secret and do not disclose our affair.²

The commentator of *al-Kāfī* explains ‘our affair’ saying:

وهو أمر الإمامة والخلافة

The affair of Imāmah and Khilāfah...³

In another narration which al-Kulaynī attributes to Ja‘far he says:

المدّيع حديثنا كالجاحد له

A person who discloses our secret is like the one who denies it.⁴

1 Al-Māzindarānī: *Sharḥ al-jāmi‘* 9/118.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/222.

3 Al-Māzindarānī: *Sharḥ al-jāmi‘* 10/26.

4 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/224.

He further says:

و أعلم أنه عليه السلام كان خائفا من أعداء الدين علي نفسه المقدسة و علي شيعته، و كان في تقية شديدة منهم فلذلك نهى عن إذاعة خبر دال علي إمامته أو إمامة آبائه

Know well that he عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was fearing the safety of his life and the safety of his partisans from the enemies of dīn, (thus) the need for him to practice Taqiyyah was greater than theirs. Thus he ordered them not to divulge his Imāmah and the Imāmah of his forefathers.¹

Furthermore, they had pledged to perpetually work in secrecy. Hence they are reported to have said:

إن أمرنا مستور مقنع بالميثاق فمن هتك علينا أذله الله

Our affair is hidden and concealed by the pledge.² May Allah disgrace the one who discloses our secret.³

Nonetheless, some of their narrations identify the time wherein the doctrine of Wilāyah was divulged. Hence, they suggest:

ما زال سرنا مكتوما حتي صار في يد ولد كيسان فتحدثوا به في الطريق و قري السواد

Our affair remained a secret till it fell in the share of the children of Kaysān.⁴ They went about talking about it in the streets and in the villages of Sawād (a place of Iraq).⁵

1 *Sharḥ al-Jāmi'* 10/26.

2 The reviser of *al-Kāfi* has commented thus upon this narration: "This refers to the pledge Allah and his Rasūl had taken from the Imāms عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام to keep the matter of Imāmah a secret from others." *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 2/227.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 2/227.

4 Kaysān is the title of Mukhtār ibn 'Ubayd al-Tahqafi who is the eponym of the Kaysāniyyah. *Sharḥ al-Jāmi'* 9/121-122.

5 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 2/223.

This surreptitious movement which laid the foundations of the concept of Wilāyah in accordance with the Sabaʿī approach did not forget to disguise its true identity and masquerade as proponents of the moderate Shīʿah in order to spread its thoughts among the people. Hence in *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* the following appears:

كفوا السنتكم و الزموا بيوتكم فإنه لا يصيبكم أمر تخصون به أبدا، ولا تزال الزيدية لكم وقاء أبدا

Hold back your tongues, remain in your homes. You will not be afflicted with a calamity which will befall you specifically. For the Zaydiyyah will always remain a shield for you.¹

This stratagem possibly implies that the Zaydiyyah, due to their expression of the desire of Wilāyah, will be implicated and you will remain clear due to practicing Taqīyyah, as is suggested by the commentator of *al-Kāfī*.²

If Wilāyah is the counterpart of Nubuwwah or even greater, then why was it kept discreet. To the extent that even Rasūl Allah ﷺ, who was ordered to convey what was revealed to him, concealed it and stealthily informed ‘Alī رضي الله عنه about it, who then communicated it secretly to whoever he wanted.

These narrations do not identify the people to whom it was communicated. They rather leave that to the discretion of ‘Alī thereby giving him the choice of informing whoever he wanted. As for those besides ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, they were not given any such discretion! So how can Wilāyah then be the basis of salvation, the acceptance of deeds, and the criterion for belief and disbelief? How could it have remained a secret till the children of Kaysān who contravened the default ruling of secrecy by disclosing it?

The nature of these narrations posits that the concocters of this doctrine were the ardent enemies of Islam who had exploited it to carry out their desires. They had confined it to secrecy and attributed it to the Ahl al-Bayt in order to find a way to the hearts of the people who were tremendously affected by the afflictions that befell them; of which they were the cause despite their ‘partisanship’.

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/225.

2 *Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ* 9/126.

Confining the Imāms to a specific number

Ibn Saba' merely claimed that 'Alī عليه السلام was the successor of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم. However, he was succeeded by others who generalised this claim for his posterity. In spite of the Shī'ī movements operating in secrecy, some of their claims would reach the Ahl al-Bayt, who would deny them openly just like their grandfather, Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī عليه السلام. Hence, they contrived the belief of Taqiyyah and ascribed it to them, thereby facilitating the propagation of their ideas with assurance of the masses not being influenced by the honest and exposing stances of the Ahl al-Bayt.

In *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, one of their seminal works, there appears a narration which suggests that Shayṭān al-Ṭāq¹ was the first person to propound the idea of Imāmah being confined to specific people of the Ahl al-Bayt. And that when Zayd ibn 'Alī learnt of this he sent him a message in order to ascertain the truth of the matter:

بلغني أنك تزعم أن في آل محمد إماما مفترض الطاعة؟ قال شيطان الطاق: نعم، و كان أبوك علي بن الحسين أحدهم، فقال: و كيف وقد كان يؤتي بلقمة وهي حارة فيبردها بيده ثم يلقمניה، أفترى أنه كان يشفق علي من حر اللقمة، ولا يشفق علي من حر النار؟ قال (شيطان الطاق) قلت له: كره أن يخبرك فتكفر فلا يكون له فيك الشفاعة لا والله فيك المشية

Zayd said to him, “It has reached me that you claim that in the household of Muḥammad there is an Imām whose obedience is mandatory?”

Shayṭān al-Ṭāq responded in the affirmative and said, “Your father 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn was one of them.”

Thereupon Zayd said, “How can that be whereas he would make a morsel of food cold in his hands and then feed me? Do you really think that he feared the heat of the morsel for me but did not fear the fire of Jahannam?”

1 The Shī'ah call him Mu'min al-Ṭāq (see: *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 185). See his biography on P. 274 - 275 of this book.

Shayṭān al-Ṭāq thus said, “He disliked informing you fearing that you would disbelieve depriving you thus of his intercession in your favour before Allah.”¹

The narration of al-Kulaynī in *al-Kāfī* reads as follows:

قال زيد بن علي لأبي جعفر: يا أبا جعفر كنت أجلس مع أبي علي الخوان فيلقمني البضعة السمينة، و يبرد لي اللقمة الحارة حتي تبرد، شفقة علي، و لم يشفق علي من حر النار، أذ أخبرك بالدين و لم يخبرني به؟ فأجابه شيطان الطاق: جعلت فداك من شفقتك علي من حر النار لم يخبرك، خاف عليك أن لا تقبله فتدخل النار، وأخبرني أنا، فإن قبلت نجوت وإن لم أقبل لم يبالي إن أدخل النار.

Zaid ibn ‘Alī said to Abū Ja‘far [i.e. Shayṭān al-Ṭāq], “O Abū Ja‘far! I would sit with my father on the table cloth where he would feed me a nice chunk of meat; out of his fear for me he would make a hot morsel of food cold. But he did not fear the heat of Jahannam for me, for he informed you of the dīn but not me?”

Shayṭān al-Ṭāq responded to him saying, “May I be sacrificed for you. Due to his fear of the fire of Jahannam for you he did not inform you; he feared that you would not accept because of which you would enter Jahannam. But he informed me, because if I accept I attain salvation and if I reject and enter Jahannam, he would not bother.”...²

After citing this narration from al-Māmaqānī’s *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*,³ Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb concludes that Shayṭān al-Ṭāq was the first person to contrive this erroneous doctrine of Imāmah, legislation, and infallibility being exclusive to a few members of the Ahl al-Bayt.⁴

He has likewise cited this quotation from *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* in his additional notes upon *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* and followed it with the following remarks:

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 186.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/186.

3 *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* 1/470.

4 *Majallah al-Faḥ* (issue no. 862, Dhū al-Ḥijjah 1367 A.H.) p. 5.

و هكذا اخترع شيطان الطاق أكذوبة الإمامة، التي صارت من أصول الديانة عند الشيعة، واتهم الإمام عليّ بن الحسين بأنه كتم أساس الدين حتي عن ابنه الذي هو من صفوة آل محمد، كما اتهم الإمام زيد بأنه لم يبلغ درجة أحسن الروافض في قابليته للإيمان بإمامة أبيه... و الشيعة هم الذين يروون هذا الخبر في أوثق المصادر عندهم و يعلنون فيه أن شيطان الطاق يزعم بوقاحتة أنه يعرف عن والد الإمام زيد ما لا يعرف الإمام زيد من والده مما يتعلق بأصل الدين عندهم. وليس هذا بكثير علي شيطان الطاق الذي روي عنه الجاحظ في كتابه عن الإمامة أن الله لم يقل ثَانِي اثْنَيْنِ إِذْ هُمَا فِي الْغَارِ.

Shayṭān al-Ṭāq was in this way successful in forging the fallacy of Imāmah which has now become the core doctrine of the Shīʿī dogma. He accused ‘Alī Zayn al-‘Ābidīn ibn al-Ḥusayn of concealing the basis of dīn from his son who was one of the elite erudite members of the Ahl al-Bayt. Just as he accused Imām Zayd of not reaching the level of even the most wretched of the Shīʿah in his ability to concede the Imāmah of his father. The Shīʿah narrate this quotation in the most authentic of their books and openly proclaim that Shayṭān al-Ṭāq—despite his wickedness—knew from the father of Imām Zayd more than even what he knew regarding the fundamentals of dīn. This is not extraordinary for Shayṭān al-Ṭāq. For al-Jāḥiẓ in his book on Imāmah narrates from him that he averred that Allah ﷻ did not reveal (the verse), “The second of the two when they were in the cave.”¹

The books of the Shīʿah mention that when the arguments which Shayṭān al-Ṭāq was promoting for the validity of Imāmah reached Jaʿfar, he said:

لو شاء ظريف من مخاصميه أن يخصمه فعل؟ قلت (القائل هو الراوي كيف ذاك؟ فقال يقول: أخبرني عن كلامك هذا من كلام إمامك؟ فإنقال: نعم، كذب علينا، وإن قال: لا قال له: كيف تتكلم بكلام لم يتكلم به إمامك، ثم قال: (أي جعفر الصادق): إنهم يتكلمون بكلام إن أنا أقررت به و رضيت به أقمت علي الضلالة، وإن برئت منه شق علي، نحن قليل و عدونا كثير، قلت: (أي الراوي) جعلت فداك فأبلغه عنك ذلك؟ قال: أما إنهم قد دخلوا في أمر ما يمنعهم عن الرجوع عنه إلا الحمية، قال: فأبلغت أبا جعفر الأحوال ذاك فقال: صدق بأبي و أمي ما يمنعني من الرجوع عنه إلا الحمية.

If a witty person of his opponents wants, he can destroy him.

1 Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah p. 195-196.

I, the narrator said, “How would that be possible for him?”

He said, “He should ask him thusly, ‘These statements of yours, are they sourced from your Imāms?’ If he says, ‘yes,’ he is lying and if he says, ‘no,’ he should say to him, ‘How are you then spreading ideas which your Imām is not a proponent of.’”

Ja’far al-Ṣādiq then said, “They make such eerie claims, if I believe them and accept them, I would become firm in disbelief, and if I reject, things would become difficult for me; we are a few and our enemies are a lot.”

I, the narrator, said, “May I be sacrificed for you! Should I not inform him of this?”

He said, “They have delved into a matter, from the retraction of which nothing is preventing them but fanaticism.”

The narrator says, “I conveyed this message to Abū Ja’far al-Aḥwal who said, “He has spoken the truth! By the oath of my parents nothing is preventing me from retracting besides fanaticism.”¹

Another person who was instrumental with Shayṭān al-Ṭāq was Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam (d. 179 A.H.). Al-Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār in fact avers that the person who claimed Naṣṣ (the divine appointment of the Imāms) and induced the people to revile Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān, the Muhājirīn, and the Anṣār was Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam. He was the fabricator of the idea of divine appointment; no one before him made such a claim.²

In *Rijāl al-Kashshī* there appears a narration which states that the conspiracy of Hishām reached Hārūn al-Rashīd:

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 190-191.

2 *Tathbīt Dalā’il al-Nubuwwah* 1/225. Perhaps the intention of al-Qāḍī is the divine appointment of specific individuals of the Ahl al-Bayt besides ‘Alī. Because the idea of his divine appointment was presented by Ibn Saba’.

يا أمير المؤمنين إني قد استنبطت أمر هشام فإذا هو يزعم أن لله في أرضه أماما غيرك مفروض الطاعة، قال سبحان الله! قال نعم، ويزعم أنه لو أمره بالخروج لخرج

Yahyā al-Barmakī said, “O Amīr al-Mu’minīn! I have investigated the affair of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam, he claims that there is an Imām besides you on the earth whose obedience is mandatory.”

He said, “Subhān Allah!”

Yahyā said, “Yes! He also claims that if this Imāms tells him to rebel he will rebel.”¹

This narration suggests that Hārūn was amazed, which implies that this idea was still in its initial stages.

Hishām had told the people that whatever he says, he says as the representative of Mūsā al-Kāẓim. The Abbasid Ruler Maḥdī subsequently imprisoned him and punished him badly. He then released him and took a pledge from him that he will not rebel against him or anyone of his progeny. To which he replied by saying:

والله ما هذا من شأني وحدثت فيه نفسي

By Allah! That is not my temperament and nor have I proposed that from my side.²

Furthermore, Ibn Taymiyah رحمته الله عليه has suggested that Mūsā al-Kāẓim was convicted of wanting to overthrow the rule of Hārūn due to which he was imprisoned.³ Ostensibly, this was because of that being attributed to him by Hishām and his cohorts. Therefore, we find that the books of the Shīʿah attest to the fact that he was imprisoned due to the statements and the lies which revolve around Imāmah

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 258.

2 Ibn Kathīr: *al-Bidāyah wa Al-Nihāyah* 10/183.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/155.

and the right of the Ahl al-Bayt to it being attributed to him... Hence, when these claims of Hishām reached Hārūn he ordered his governor thus:

شد يدك بهذا وأصحابه وبعث إلي أبي الحسن موسى عليه السلام فحبسه. فكان سبب حبسه مع غيره
من الأسباب

Keep a tight grip on this person and his cohorts. He then sent his police to imprison Abū al-Ḥasan Mūsā. So this was the reason for his imprisonment, among other reasons.¹

The books of the Shī'ah have likewise suspected Hishām of being part of those who assassinated Mūsā al-Kāẓim.² Hence their books say:

هشام بن الحكم... ضال مضل شرك في دم أبي الحسن

Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam... a deviant person who lead others astray. He was part of those who killed Abū al-Ḥasan.³

Mūsā al-Kāẓim had requested him to desist from making such statements. After desisting for a month he started again whereupon he said:

أيسرك أن تشرك في دم امرئ مسلم؟ قال: لا، قال: وكيف تشرك في دمي، فإن سكت وإلا فهو الذبح. فما
سكت حتي كان من أمره ما كان (صلي الله عليه وسلم).

Mūsā al-Kāẓim asked him, “Does it please you to play a role in the murder of a Muslim?”

“No,” he said.

Mūsā al-Kāẓim then said to him, “Then why would you want to play a role in my murder? If you do not desist I will be slaughtered.”

He, however, did not remain silent, till eventual what happened, happened.⁴

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 262.

2 Because the Shī'ah claim that he was poisoned and killed in the prison of Hārūn al-Rashīd.

3 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 268.

4 *Ibid.* p. 270-271, 279.

Therefore al-Riḍā said, as the books of the Shī'ah allege:

هشام بن الحكم فهو الذي صنع بأبي الحسن ما صنع وقال لهم وأخبرهم أترى أن الله يغفر له ما ركب منا

Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam did whatever he did to Abū al-Ḥasan (al-Kāzim). He then told them of what he had did and said, “Do you think Allah will forgive him for the crimes he has committed against us.”¹

The books of the Shī'ah also reveal that Hishām was brought up by heretics. Hence in *Rijāl al-Kashshī* the following narration appears:

وهشام كان من غلمان أبي شاكِر وأبو شاكِر كان زنديقا

Hishām was the slave of Abū Shākir who was a heretic.²

Despite this assertion, one of the contemporary scholars of the Shī'ah states the following regarding Hishām, the man of all this mayhem as documented in the most reliable books of the Shī'ah:

لم يعثر أحد من سلفنا علي شيء مما نسبته الخصم إليه

No one has come across the evils that the opponents ascribe to him.³

I am not sure if the reality is not known to him. Or if he is denying it by way of Taqiyyah thinking that people have no knowledge of what is in their books.

The conclusion nonetheless is that Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam, Shayṭān al-Ṭāq, and their protégés were the ones who had revived the idea of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ which was specific to ‘Alī عليه السلام and thereafter generalised it for the other members

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 278.

2 Abū Shākir al-Dīṣānī the eponym of the Dīṣāniyyah. He was one of the people who had misguided Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam (al-Rāfi‘ī: *Taḥt Rāyat al-Qur’ān* p. 176).

3 ‘Abd al-Ḥusain al-Mūsawī: *al-Murāja‘āt* p. 313.

of the Ahl al-Bayt. In doing so, they took advantage of some of the atrocities that befell them, like that of the martyrdom of ‘Alī and his son Ḥusayn. This paved the way for them to provoke the feelings of the people and influence their hearts in order to accomplish their malicious agendas which they harboured against the Muslim Ummah.

Ostensibly, it seems that the belief of Imāmah being confined to specific people gained a lot of traction in Kūfah¹ with the efforts of the followers of Hishām and Shayṭān al-Ṭāq. One of those who were invited to believe in this doctrine made a trip to Ja‘far in order to ascertain the veracity thereof. Hence al-Kashshī narrates the following from Abū Sa‘īd al-A‘raj:

كنا عند أبي عبد الله رضي الله عنه فاستأذن له رجلان فإذا لهما فقال أحدهما: أفيكم أمام مفترض الطاعة؟ قال: ما أعرف ذلك فينا، قال: بالكوفة قوم يزعمون أن فيكم أماما مفترض الطاعة، وهم لا يكذبون أصحاب ورع واجتهاد... منهم عبد الله بن يعفور وفلان وفلاو، فقال أبو عبد الله رضي الله عنه: ما أمرتهم بذلك، ولا قلت لهم أن يقولوه، قال فما ذنبي! واحمر وجهه وغضب غضبا شديدا، قال: فلما رأيا الغضب في وجهه قاما فخرجا، قال أتعرفون الرجلين؟ قلنا: نعم هما رجلان من الزيدية

We were sitting with Abū ‘Abd Allāh (al-Ṣādiq) when two people sought his permission to enter, and he granted them permission.

One of them said, “Is there an Imām amongst you whose obedience is compulsory?”

He replied, “I do not know any such person.”

On this the same person said, “In Kūfah there are people who claim that among you there is an Imām whose obedience is compulsory, they don’t seem to be lying because they are people of piety and sacrifice. Some of them are ‘Abd Allah ibn Ya‘fūr, so and so, and so and so.”

Abū ‘Abd Allah عليه السلام thus said, “I did not instruct them to say any of that.”²

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 100/259.

2 There is a subtle indication in this answer that the denial of Ja‘far was by way of Taqiyyah.

He further said, “What is my mistake?” as his face became red and he was infuriated.

The narrator says, “When they saw his anger they stood up and left.

Abū ‘Abd Allah asked, “Do you know these two people?”

We replied, “Yes! These are two men of the Zaydiyyah.”¹

Hence, the concept of the Imāms being confined to a specific number was planted in the second century by a group of people who falsely claimed to be the partisans of the Ahl al-Bayt, the likes of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam and Shayṭān al-Ṭāq.

Moving on, the Shī‘ah have tremendously differed as to the exact count of their Imāms; the author of *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* mentions:

اعلم أن الإمامية قائلون بانحصار الأئمة، ولكنهم مختلفون في مقدارهم، فقال بعضهم: خمسة، وبعضهم: سبعة، وبعضهم: ثمانية: وبعضهم: اثنا عشر، وبعضهم ثلاثة عشر

Know well that the Imāmiyyah hold the view that their Imāms are specified but they have differed in their specific count. Some of them say five, some say seven, some say eight, some say twelve, and some (even) say thirteen.²

They have numerous views in this regard. If I were to present all their views sourcing them from the books of heresiography, the reader would presumably give up reading out of boredom and fatigue. The basis of all these variant opinions is one, and that is after the demise of each Imām of the Ahl al-Bayt many sub-sects would come into existence. Some would be indefinite about the death of the Imām thereby assuming him to be the last Imām upon whom they would terminate Imāmah and the count of the Imāms. Whereas some would go in search of another member of the Ahl al-Bayt and make him the new ‘Imām’

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 427.

2 *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* p. 193.

securing in this manner the niche to introduce into dīn its old inherited rituals or its cultural and racist inclinations thereby securing the clout to carry out its enmities and accomplish its aspirations. It will suffice for the reader to read the books of heresiography to learn all of this. In fact even the books of the Shī'ah have recorded some examples of these differences and contradictions, whether they be the books of the Ismā'īliyyah like that of *Masā'il al-Imāmah* of al-Nāshī' al-Akbar and *al-Zīnah* of Ibn Abī Ḥātim, or the books of the Twelvers like that of *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* of al-Ash'arī al-Qummī and *Firaq al-Shī'ah* of al-Nawbakhtī, or the books of the Zaydiyyah like that of *al-Munyah wa al-Amal* of al-Murtaḍā.

Not forgetting that the issue of Imāmah is not a secondary issue in their creed wherein difference of opinion is unobjectionable. It is rather the very basis of their dogma and its most crucial component, for a person who does not believe in their 'Imām' is not a believer. Which is why we see them dubbing each other infidels. Sometimes even the followers of one Imām excommunicate and curse each other.¹

The Twelvers have settled upon twelve Imāms. In the family of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, the Banū Hāshim, during the reign of Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān, and 'Alī, however, there was no one who proposed the view of twelve Imāms.² The belief of twelve Imāms only came into existence after the demise of Ḥasan al-'Askarī, as has passed already.³

Hence we find some narrations in the tradition of the Twelvers which give of some indications as to the confusion and quandary that they encountered in the number of Imāms. This ostensibly suggests that they are forgeries which were fabricated before the demise of Ḥasan al-'Askarī and that prior to that the belief of the twelve Imāms, to whom the Twelvers subscribe, did not exist. Or that

1 This was a common problem amongst them (see: *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 498-499) also refer to p. 1014 of this book.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/111.

3 See p.130 of this book.

they were fabricated before this became the established belief of the *Ja'fariyyah* (a sect which emerged after the demise of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī). These narrations themselves are certainly a critique of the Twelver stance.

Hence the narrations of *al-Kāfī* which state that “‘Alī عليه السلام could secretly inform whoever he wanted regarding Wilāyah,”¹ (which is explained by the commentator of *al-Kāfī* to mean, “Whoever he wanted to inform from the infallible Imāms.”)² do not stipulate any number or specify any individuals. So it is as if the matter was not settled at the time of the fabrication of these narrations. You will also find narrations which state that the total sum of the Imāms is seven. They state:

سابعنا قائمنا

Our seventh Imām is our Mahdī.³

This is the stance of the *Ismāʿīliyyah*. However, when the number of the Imāms increased according to the *Mūsawīyyah* or the *Qaṭʿiyyah*, who later formed into Twelvers, the aforementioned narration induced doubt in the doctrine of Imāmah for their followers. Thus the pioneers thereof endeavoured to eradicate this doubt with the following narration:

عن داود الرقي قال: قلت لأبي الحسن الرضا رضي الله عنه: جعلت فداك إنه ولله ما يلج في صدري من أمرك شيء إلا حديثاً سمعته من ذريح يرويه عن أبي جعفر رضي الله عنه قال لي: وما هو؟ قال: سمعته يقول: سابعنا قائمنا إن شاء الله قال: صدقت وصدق ذريح وصدق أبو جعفر رضي الله عنه، فازددت والله شكاً، ثم قال: يا داود بن أبي خالد! أما والله لولا أن موسى قال للعالم ستجدني إن شاء الله صابراً ما سأله عن شيء، وكذلك أبو جعفر عليه السلام لولا أن قال: إن شاء الله لكان كما قال، قال: فقطعت عليه

Dāwūd al-Raqqī says, “I asked Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā: may I be sacrificed for thee! I have no scepticism in my bosom regarding any of your teachings besides one narration which I heard from Dharīḥ which he narrates from Abū Jaʿfar عليه السلام.”

1 This has passed on p. 892

2 Al-Māzindarānī: *Sharḥ al-Jāmiʿ* 9/123.

3 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 373.

Al-Riḍā asked, “Which narration is that?”

I said, “I heard him saying, ‘Our seventh Imām will be our Mahdī if Allah wills.’”

Al-Riḍā responded, “You have spoken the truth, Dharrīḥ has spoken the truth, and Abū Ja‘far has spoken the truth.”

This made me doubt even more.

Thereafter al-Riḍā said, “O Dāwūd, the son of Abū Khālīd! If Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام had not said [to Khidr], ‘You will find me to be patient,’ he would not have asked him regarding anything; likewise if Abū Ja‘far had not said, ‘If Allah wills’ what he said would have transpired.”

The narrator says, “I thus believed him.”¹

It seems as though they consider this to be the result of Badā’ and the changing of the intention of Allah, which is one of their fundamental beliefs (as will feature soon). In this belief they find a means of deflecting this narration and its likes.

The first book of the Shī‘ah which surfaced was the book of *Sulaym ibn Qays*. Therein it is mentioned that the total sum of the Imāms is thirteen. This was one of the reasons for the Twelvers condemning his book. In *al-Kāfī*, the most authentic of their four early canonical works, many narrations appear which suggest that there were thirteen Imāms. Hence al-Kulaynī narrates the following from Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq:

إني واثني عشر إماما من ولدي وأنت يا علي زر الأرض، يعني أوتادها وجبالها. بنا أوتد الله الأرض أن
تسيخ بأهلها فإذا ذهب الإثنا عشر من ولدي ساخت الأرض بأهلها ولم ينظروا

Rasūl Allah ﷺ said, “I, the twelve Imāms from my progeny, and you, O ‘Alī, are the pegs of this earth and its mountains. Allah ﷻ has kept the

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 373-374.

earth firm by way of us so that it does not sink with its inhabitants. When the Twelve Imāms leave the world it will sink with its people and there will be given no respite.”¹

This narration posits that the Imāms are twelve excluding ‘Alī and thirteen including him. Thus it destroys the basis of the Twelvers. In his *al-Ghaybah al-Ṭūsī*, seeing the obvious problem, distorted the narration and presented it thus:

إني وأحد عشر من ولدي

I and eleven Imāms from my progeny.²

The books of the Shī‘ah likewise narrate the following from Abū Ja‘far who narrates from Jābir:

دخلت علي فاطمة وبين يديها لوح فيه اسماء الأوصياء من ولدها فعددت اثني عشر آخرهم القائم ثلاثة منهم محمد و ثلاثة منهم علي

I went to visit Fāṭimah and before her was a tablet wherein was documented the names of all the appointed successors from her posterity. I thus counted twelve Imāms, the last of whom was the Mahdī; three among them were Muḥammad and three among them were ‘Alī.³

Consider, they have considered all their Imāms to be from the progeny of Fāṭimah. This implies that ‘Alī is not one of them because he is her husband and not her son. Or the other conclusion would be that they have thirteen Imāms including him. Another hint in this narration which suggests that he is not part of the Imāms is the statement ‘three among them are ‘Alī’. This is due to the fact that there are four Imāms among the Ahl al-Bayt whose names are ‘Alī, viz. Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Alī, ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, ‘Alī al-Riḍā, and ‘Alī al-Hādī.

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/534.

2 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 92

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/532; Ibn Bābawayh: *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 263; al-Mufīd: *Al-Irshād* p. 393; al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 92.

Ibn Bābawayh, ostensibly distorted this narration by omitting ‘from her posterity’ but forgot to take heed of the rest of the text which is, “Three among them are ‘Alī,” hence he maintains it as it appears in the references of the Twelvers.¹ However, in his book *‘Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā* he, or someone else, changes the text in both places.²

Astonishingly, one of their scholars classed the book of *Sulaym ibn Qays* a fabrication due to it containing the mention of thirteen Imāms. But he does not make a similar judgement regarding *al-Kāfī* and the other sources which cite similar narrations.

The view of thirteen Imāms was upheld by a sub-sect of the Shī‘ah. It is probably due to their influence that these narrations exist. Al-Ṭūsī has made mention of this sub-sect and its opposition of the view of Twelve Imāms, to which he subscribes.³ Al-Najāshī likewise has mentioned the same in the biography of Hibat Allāh ibn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad.⁴ Each of these sects claims to be on the straight path and that the narrations regarding the legitimacy of its Imāms are widespread. It simultaneously refutes the claims of the remaining Shī‘ī sects. This is an evident sign of them having no basis for what they believe, for if the narrations of any sect were widespread there would not have been any bickering at all. Hence, these are claims which they have forged against the Ahl al-Bayt in accordance with the demands of the time. Every sect would thus claim an Imām for itself in order to collect *Khums* (one fifth of the booty), monetary vows, and gifts from their followers in the name of their alleged Imām, and thereby live

1 Ibn Bābawayh: *al-Khiṣāl* p. 477-478.

2 *‘Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā* 2/52.

3 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 137.

4 He mentions, “Hibat Allah engaged in the sciences of theology and attend the gatherings of Abū al-Ḥusayn ibn Shaybah al-‘Alawī who was a Zaydī. He wrote a book and mentioned therein that there are thirteen Imāms including Zayd ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn. In substantiating his stance he drew support from a narration which appears in the book of *Sulaym ibn Qays al-Hilālī* which reads thus, “There are twelve Imāms from the posterity of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn.” (see: *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 343).

luxurious lives. Those who succeeded them then followed them without any evidence which consequently caused them to fall into the pit of deviance:

إِنَّهُمْ أَفْوَوْا أَبَاءَهُمْ ضَالِّينَ فَهُمْ عَلَىٰ أَثَارِهِمْ يُھَرَّعُونَ

Indeed they found their fathers astray. So they hastened [to follow] in their footsteps.^{1,2}

Analysing the belief of confining the Imāms to a specific number

Allah ﷻ says:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ وَأَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ وَأُولِي الْأَمْرِ مِنْكُمْ

O you who have believed, obey Allah and obey the Messenger and those in authority among you.³

Allah ﷻ has not specified a number of the ‘people of authority’ which is obvious.

If the doctrine of divine appointment of the Imāms is the most crucial aspect of dīn according to them and is equal to Nubuwwah in its rank or even greater, then why did Allah ﷻ not make mention of it in His Book? Similarly, why did he not make mention of the Imāms, their names, and their personalities? There is no mention of their Imāms in the Qur’ān, nor is there any widespread narration which serves as an emphatic text for their appointment. Had there been any, the Shī’ah would not have disputed as dramatically in their appointment, as the books of heresiography have recorded. Rasūl Allah ﷺ in the narrations which are widely narrated from him does not confine the people of authority

1 Sūrah al-Ṣaffāt: 69-70.

2 Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah p. 200.

3 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 59.

to a specific number. The narration of Abū Dhar in the *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* reads as follows:

إن خليلي أو صاني أن أسمع وأطيع وإن كان عبد حبشيا مجدع الأطراف

My friend advised me to listen and obey, even though the ruler be an Abyssinian slave whose limbs are severed.¹

There are many more narrations of this sort.²

As for the books of the Twelvers, they are replete with narrations which limit the Imāms to twelve. However, it should be noted that these narrations were circulated in secret and the Imāms would disassociate from the narrators thereof, which is enough to stir scepticism regarding their authenticity. Especially, when the Book of Allah (which the Imāms were commanded to have recourse to when passing judgements) does not support any of them; unless of course through esoteric interpretations of its verses and through forged narrations which have consequently assumed the status of their best evidence in spite of their falsehood being empirically established. Likewise, the early scholars who had forged all these narrations, the likes of Ṣaffār, Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, and al-Kulaynī were all extremists who necessarily have to be excommunicated due to their documentation of the narrations of the interpolation of the Qur’ān. They are thus unreliable and their books unworthy.

Furthermore, the book *Nahj al-Balāghah*, which is accorded the status of the most authentic book, does not contain any mention of the twelve Imāms and their personalities. In fact there appears a narration therein which defies the doctrine of the twelve Imāms. The author of *Nahj al-Balāghah* hence says:

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/105. The wording of al-Bukhārī is thus: Nabī ﷺ said to Abū Dhar, “Listen and obey even if the ruler be a slave whose head is like a raisin.” *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: chapter regarding Adhān: the sub-chapter regarding the leadership of an astray and innovator: 2/188. The wording mentioned in the above is that of Muslim. *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter regarding leadership: sub-chapter regarding the incumbency of obedience to the leaders in matters which are not sins: 2/1467.

2 Ibn Taymiyah has mentioned some of them in *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/105-106.

إنه لا بد للناس من أمير ير أو فاجر... يقاتل به العدو، وتأمين السبل، ويؤخذ به للضعيف من القوي حتي يستريح بر ويستراح من فاجر

It is compulsory for the people to have a ruler, pious or impious, with who the enemy can be subdued, the roads secured, and the rights of the weak demanded from the strong so that the noble people be at ease and the wretched ones done away with.¹

This narration does not limit the Imāms to a number. So where are the Shī'ah going whereas they claim to follow every letter of the *Nahj*?

Similarly, the disparate views of the Shī'ah in this regard, the stark differences of their sects in the specification of the Imāms and their personalities also expose the reality of this idea. For every sect debunks the claims of the other and belies it. And Allah is sufficient for the believers in war.²

Furthermore, the concept of the Imāms only being twelve in total is not acceptable logically and practically; for will the Ummah remain without an Imām after the termination of the specific number? Because the era of the open Imāms of the Shī'ah does not exceed two and a half centuries.

The Shī'ah were, therefore, compelled to somehow find a solution to the confinement of the Imāms by asserting that the Mujtahid holds the position of representing the Imām. They have then differed as to the limitations of this representation.³ In recent times they have practically discarded this principle, which holds the most integral position in their religion, by electing a president for their country through the process of election. They have moved on from quantitative limitation to a qualitative one; they have thus limited the position of presidency to a Shī'ī *Faqīh* (scholar).⁴

1 *Nahj al-Balāghah* p. 82.

2 See the writings of Abū Hātim al-Rāzī regarding the doubts he creates regarding the Imāmah of the Twelve Imāms from after Ja'far al-Ṣādiq in his book *al-Zīnah* (manuscript): p. 232-233.

3 Muḥammad Mughniyah: *al-Khumaynī wa al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 68.

4 *Al-Khumaynī: al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 48.

With that being said, the Shī'ah, in substantiation of the idea of twelve Imāms, use a narration which appears in the books of ḥadīth which is narrated from Jābir ibn Samurah. It says:

يكون اثنا عشر أميراً - فقال كلمة لم أسمعها فقال أبي إنه قال: كلهم من قريش

“There will be twelve leaders.” Then he said something which I did not hear. My father explained that he said, “All of them will be from the Quraysh.”

This is the wording of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*.¹ The narration of Muslim from Jābir goes as follows:

سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول: لا يزال الإسلام عزيزاً إلى اثني عشر خليفة ثم قال كلمة لم أفهمها. فقلت لأبي: ما قال؟ قال: كلهم من قريش

I heard Rasūl Allah ﷺ saying, “Islām will remain supreme till twelve rulers.” He then said something which I did not understand. So I asked my father what he said. He said, “They will all be from the Quraysh.”²

Another version states:

لا يزال هذا الدين عزيزاً منيعاً إلى اثني عشر خليفة

This dīn will reign supreme and glorious till twelve rulers.³

While yet another version states:

لا يزال أمر الناس ما مضى ما وليهم اثنا عشر رجلاً

The affairs of the people will run smoothly till twelve men rule over them.⁴

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, chapter regarding legal judgments, sub-chapter regarding appointing a successor, 8/127.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, chapter regarding leadership, sub-chapter regarding people being subject to Quraysh in matters of khilāfah, 2/1453.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid. p. 1452.

The narration of *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* reads thus:

لا يزال هذا الدين قائما حتي يكون عليكم اثنا عشر خليفة، كلهم تجتمع عليهم الأمة.

This dīn will remain established till twelve rulers rule over you. The entire Ummah will unite upon each one of them.¹

Another narration of Abū Dāwūd which he narrates through the transmission of Aswad ibn Saʿīd from Jābir has the following addition:

فلما رجع إلي منزله اتته قريش فقالوا: ثم يكون ماذا؟ قال: الهرج

When he returned home the Quraysh came to him and asked him, “Then what will happen?”

He said, “Large scale fighting.”²

The Shīʿah cling onto these narrations and present them as evidence against the Ahl al-Sunnah, not because they believe in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah³ but to establish evidence against them by way of that which they concede.

By deliberating over these texts with impartiality and objectivity we will learn that these twelve individuals are described as:

- People who will assume the position of khilāfah,
- Islam in their era will be mighty and glorious,
- Their subjects will unanimously accept them as the rulers,
- Their leadership will be a means of people’s affairs running smoothly.

1 *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, chapter regarding the Mahdī: 4/471.

2 Ibid. 4/472. In *Musnad al-Bazzār* this narration is mentioned with a slight variation which is as follows: ‘He then returned home so I came to him and asked him, “Then what will happen?” He said, “large scale fighting.” (ibn Ḥajr al-ʿAsqalānī: *Fath al-Bārī* 13/211).

3 *Al-Khiṣāl* p. 470; *al-Ghaybah* p. 88; *al-Arbilī: Kashf al-Ghummaḥ* p. 56-57; *al-Bayāḍī: al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm* 2/100; *Shibr: Haqq al-Yaqīn* p. 338; *al-Samāwī: al-Imāmah* 1/147, etc.

None of these prove true for the twelve individuals whom the Shī'ah regard as their Imāms with the exception of 'Alī and Ḥasan who ruled for a short period, then too, the Ummah did not unite upon them. Similarly, the affairs of the Ummah were not stable in their eras, rather they were constantly unstable; oppressors, neigh disbelievers,¹ ruled over them; the Imāms themselves practiced dissimulation and remained discreet in the matters of their dīn. The era of Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is similarly, considered to be an era of Taqiyyah,² as is mentioned by al-Mufīd,³ wherein he was unable to reveal the true Qur'ān and establish many of the injunctions of Islam, as attested to by al-Jazā'iri.⁴ He was compelled to collaborate with the Ṣaḥābah and work with them to the detriment of dīn, as conceded by al-Murtaḍā.⁵ Hence the ḥadīth is completely unrelated to the claim that they make.

Furthermore, the ḥadīth does not confine the Imāms to twelve, rather it is a prophecy of Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ that Islam will reign supreme during the reign of twelve individuals.

The era of the righteous Khulafā' and the Umayyads was an era wherein Islam was mighty and glorious. Hence Shaykh al-Islam mentions:

إن الإسلام وشرائعه في زمن بني أمية أظهر وأوسع مما كان بعدهم

Islam and its injunctions were more established and pervasive during the era of the Umayyads.

He then substantiates his positions with the following narration:

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/210; *al-Muntaqā* p. 533. Their narrations which assert that all the people turned renegade after demise of Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ besides three people, likewise after the martyrdom of Ḥusayn besides three people, are coming ahead.

2 *Mukhtaṣar al-Ṣawāqī* p. 43-44.

3 See p. 57 of this book.

4 See p. 268 - 269 of this book.

5 See p. 565 - 566 of this book.

لا يزال هذا الأمر عزيزاً إلي اثني عشر خليفة كلهم من قريش

This dīn will reign supreme till the rule of twelve rulers who will all be from the Quraysh.

He further says:

وهكذا كان، فكان الخلفاء أبو بكر وعمر وعثمان وعلي ثم تولي من اجتمع الناس عليه وصار له عز و
منعة: معاوية وابنه يزيد ثم عبد الملك وأولاده الأربعة وبينهم عمر بن عبد العزيز وبعد ذلك حصل من
النقص ما هو باق إلي الآن.

And this is exactly how things were; the Khulafā' were Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān and 'Alī. They were succeeded by whom the Ummah unanimously accepted, Mu'āwiyah, his son, Yazīd, and 'Abd al-Malik and his four sons. Between them was the rule of 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz. After them the condition of dīn started deteriorating and has continued to deteriorate till today.¹

Furthermore, according to the Twelvers the rulership of the 'awaited Mahdī' will remain till the end of time. This implies that there will be no era which will be void of the rule of the Twelve Imāms; there will be no two eras, i.e. an era wherein the affairs of the Ummah will be stable and an era wherein they will be unstable. This is obviously against the purport of the ḥadīth.² It is likewise against the doctrine of the Shī'ah which asserts that the era of the Twelve Imāms is an era of Taqiyyah until the emergence of the 'Mahdī'; a Shī'ī who does not practice Taqiyyah therein is equal to a person who abandons ṣalāh.³

In addition, just as the Ummah did not unite upon the Imāms due to the fact that they did not rule, the Shī'ah themselves did not unite upon them; they have amidst themselves held variant views regarding the Imāms, their precise

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/206.

2 *Ibid* 4/210.

3 Refer to the section of Taqiyyah.

amount, and their personalities. Such variant views which cannot be enumerated but with difficulty. An evident exposition of this can be found in the books of heresiography.

Another aspect which Ibn Taymiyah mentions regarding the ḥadīth is that it states, “They will all be from the Quraysh.” This means that these rulers do not necessarily have to be from the family of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ; had that been the case, he would have mentioned a family line which would create a distinction between them and the others. Consider, Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not say that they will be from the posterity of Ismā‘īl or that they will be Arabs even though they all were. This is because he intended to specify the tribe which makes them different from the others. Hence if they really were required to be from the Banū Hāshim or from the family of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, he would have described them accordingly. But they were required to be from the Quraysh due to the assertion in the narration that they will be from the Quraysh; not from a specific family thereof, but from its different branches like that of the Banū Taym, Banū ‘Adī, Banū ‘Abd Shams, and the Banū Hāshim to which all the righteous rulers belonged.¹

Therefore, besides the aspect of the number “twelve” which cannot prove anything, this ḥadīth does not hold any evidence for what the Shī‘ah intend to prove. Do you not know that this very number which is used to describe the righteous rulers, is used in another narration to describe their opposites? Hence the narration of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* reads as follows:

فِي أُمَّتِي اثْنَا عَشَرَ مَنَّاقًا

In my Ummah there will be twelve hypocrites.²

It apparently seems as if this number which the Twelver Shī‘ah adore is derived

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/211.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter regarding the characteristics of the hypocrites and their rulings: 3/2143-2144.

from the old Jewish conjecture which is mentioned in the book of Daniel,¹ as is indicated by Ibn Taymiyah.²

Their Evidence Regarding Imāmah:

One of the principle beliefs of the Shī'ah is that it is impermissible for the masses to elect an Imām. Rather *Naṣṣ* (divine emphatic appointment) is required.³ Hence Imāmah cannot be without *Naṣṣ*.⁴ Rasūl Allah ﷺ emphatically appointed 'Alī رضي الله عنه and his children.⁵ They will thus be the Imāms till the Day of Judgment.

We had previously studied that this doctrine was contrived by the Saba'iyyah, the Hishāmiyyah, and the Shayṭāniyyah. The scholars of the Shī'ah, however, aver that this doctrine is the institution of Allah, his Rasūl ﷺ, and the Ahl al-Bayt...

In substantiating this doctrine, they took many texts, all unknown to the experts of the Sunnah and the transmitters of the Sharī'ah, transmitted them and interpreted them in accordance with their dogma. Most of them are in fact either forgeries, narrations with flawed chains of transmission, or narrations which do not accommodate their invalid interpretations.⁶

1 In his book which he has compiled regarding the Mahdī Abū al-Ḥasan ibn al-Munādī mentions, "I found the following in the book of Daniel, 'When the 'Mahdī' dies five men from the tribe of the biggest son (of Israel), then five men from the tribe of the youngest son (of Israel). The last among them will then bequeath that the rule should be passed on to a man from the children of the eldest son. He will be followed by his son which brings the total amount to twelve. Each one of them will be guided.'" (*Fath al-Bārī* 13/310).

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/210.

3 Al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī: *al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah fī Uṣūl al-A'immaḥ* p. 142; Ibn al-Muṭahhar: *Nahj al-Mustarshidīn* p. 63.

4 Al-Muẓaffar: *'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah* p. 103.

5 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*: chapter regarding the Imāms being emphatically appointed by Allah and his Rasūl: 1/286.

6 Ibn Khaldūn: *al-Muqaddamah* (with the revision of 'Alī 'Abd al-Wāḥid al-Wāfi) 2/ 527.

They have exceeded all bounds, as they usually do, in accumulating narrations and texts which establish this doctrine. Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī has even prepared a book by the name *al-Alfayn fī Imāmah Amīr al-Mu'minīn*, i.e. Two thousand reports for the Imāmah of Amīr al-Mu'minīn.¹

Due to it being the most crucial aspect of their dīn there is hardly a Shī'ī scholar who has not written regarding it.²

You should know that, according to the standards of the Shī'ah, all these narrations were only narrated by lone individuals, rather by 'Alī عليه السلام alone, due to him being the door (of the city of knowledge); to the extent that a person who claims to hear from any one besides him is considered to have committed a crime equivalent to ascribing a partner to Allah.³ Similarly, besides 'Alī عليه السلام and a few among the Ṣaḥābah (three, four or seven), as the books of the Shī'ah state, the rest of the people renounced Islam; thus rendering their narrations unacceptable.

The narrations of a lone person are expected to be doubted, especially when a very large group of people narrates completely conflicting reports. This, posing an obvious predicament to the Shī'ah, made them invent the concept of *'Iṣmah* (infallibility). However this “infallibility” itself is dubitable. For it cannot be established for a person who alone claims it for himself. They were thus compelled to formulate another concept, the concept of *Mu'jizah* (miracles for the Imāms). Hence, the doctrine of Imāmah revolves around these three concepts: *Naṣṣ*, *'Iṣmah*, and *Mu'jizah*.

Their scholar al-Mufīd asserts:

1 He has, however, fallen short of reaching two thousand narrations; he has sufficed on mentioning a thousand and thirty eight reports which he considers evidence for his claim (al-A'lamī: *Muqaddamah al-Alfayn* p. 10).

2 *Al-Dharī'ah Ilā Taṣānīf al-Shī'ah* 1/320.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/377.

إن الإمامة توجب لصاحبها عند الإثني عشرية: العصمة والنص والمعجزة

Imāmah according to the Twelvers establishes the following three things for its incumbent: *Naṣṣ*, *‘Iṣmah*, and *Mu‘jizah*.¹

The discussion regarding *Mu‘jizāt* only transpiring at the hands of the *Ambiyā’*, the attribution thereof to the Imāms by the Shī‘ah due to according them the status of *Nubuwwah* and their belief that the Imāms are the evidence of Allah upon the creation (despite not having any evidence besides blindly following what the heretics of the previous centuries had invented) has passed already. Allah ﷻ says:

لَنَلَّا يَكُونُ لِلنَّاسِ عَلَى اللَّهِ حُجَّةٌ بَعْدَ الرُّسُلِ

So that mankind will have no argument against Allah after the messengers.²

He does not make any mention of the Imāms after the prophets. Hence the evidence of Allah ﷻ was established upon his bondsmen through his Messengers whom He had aided with miracles.

The Shī‘ah do not have any evidence to substantiate the miracles of their Imāms besides empty claims which any cunning and deceitful person is able to concoct with the sleight of his hand.³

Even if we hypothetically consider the *Mu‘jizāt* to have transpired, they are dependent upon reports; but how can the reports of ‘renegades’ elicit reliability. Likewise is the case of *‘Iṣmah*. In spite of this the Shī‘ah lend tremendous importance to the reports which represent *Naṣṣ* and *Waṣīyyah* (appointment by bequest) which they treat as the foundation of their dogma and the principle belief for their theological structure.

1 *Al-‘Uyūn* 2/127.

2 *Sūrah al-Nisā’*: 165.

3 See p. 845 of this book.

As for the issue of *‘Iṣmah*, due to its pivotal role in the Shīr dogma I have dedicated the coming subchapter to it.

There is no doubt as to the fact that emphatically appointing the rulers who are to rule over the Ummah till the Day of Qiyāmah is impossible but according to the Shīr logic. This has led them to belief in a very grave misconception, i.e. the belief in a person who according to them is alive for centuries (the ‘Mahdī’ whose return they anticipate). They have thus become the laughing stock for people. ‘Alī al-Riḍā rebutted this misconception of theirs with a response which can be considered the strongest and most rhetorically superior in this regard. The Shīah have cited it in their most reliable books. Hence he is reported to have said:

لو كان الله يمد في أجل أحد بني آدم لحاجة الخلق إليه لمد الله في أجل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله

If Allah were to prolong the age of any human due to him being an indispensable asset for the creation he would have prolonged the age of Rasūl Allah ﷺ.¹

However, they have defied this primary remark and have believed over the centuries that the ‘awaited Mahdī’ is alive due to the creation, rather the entire world, being in need of him; should this earth be deprived of him it will face ruination with its inhabitants.

After these comments on the issue of Naṣṣ, I do not think there is a need to delve into their narrations which they present in this regard. Because it has ultimately reached the stage of just believing in the fictitious ‘Mahdī’ whose presence is not felt or seen and regarding who there is no shred of evidence or information. If the people really needed him, Rasūl Allah ﷺ—who was better than him—was more deserving of staying alive. But the Ummah, thanks to its Qur’ān and the rich legacy of its Nabī, does not need an imaginary ‘Mahdī’ nor an imaginary book. The details of this will come in the discussion regarding occultation.

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 458.

The Shī'ah, nonetheless, claim that the Qur'ān makes emphatic mention of the Imāmah of their Imāms and that the issue of Naṣṣ is unanimously accepted by both the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah. They have thus endeavoured to make the Ahl al-Sunnah part of their imaginary beliefs in order to deceitfully ensnare its adherents. If this is the case, then we ought to study what the books of the Shī'ah offer in this regard.

I shall thus first present their strongest evidences from the Qur'ān and the Sunnah, and thereafter present their evidences which are exclusive to them.

I shall thereafter terminate with a discussion on the issue of Naṣṣ in light of the Qur'ān, the Sunnah, reason, and the commonly known and universally accepted aspects of our dīn.

Their Evidences from the Qur'ān:

Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifāh al-Ṭūsī mentions:

وَأَمَّا النَّصُّ عَلَى إِمَامَتِهِ مِنَ الْقُرْآنِ فَأَقْوَى مَا يَدُلُّ عَلَيْهِ قَوْلُهُ تَعَالَى: إِنَّمَا وَلِيُّكُمُ اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا
الَّذِينَ يُقِيمُونَ الصَّلَاةَ وَيُؤْتُونَ الزَّكَاةَ وَهُمْ رَاكِعُونَ

As to his emphatic appointment in the Qur'ān, the strongest evidence for that is the verse, “Your ally is none but Allah and His Messenger, and those who have believed—those who establish ṣalāh, give zakāh, and they bow in worship.”^{1,2}

Al-Ṭabarsī mentions:

وهذه الآية من أوضح الدلائل على صحة أمانة علي بعد النبي بلا فصل

This verse is from amongst the strongest proofs for the legitimacy of his immediate succession, Imāmah, after Rasūl Allāh.³

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 55

2 Talkhīṣ al-Shāfi' 2/10.

3 Majma' al-Bayān 2/128.

Their scholars seem to unanimously concur that this verse is the strongest evidence according to them, for in their works, they always present it first when substantiating their stance.¹

But how exactly do they derive their evidence from this verse? They state that:

اتفق المفسرون والمحدثون من العامة والخاصة أنها نزلت في علي لما تصدق بخاتمه علي المسكين في الصلاة بمحضر من الصحابة وهو مذكور في الصحاح الستة. وإنما للحصر باتفاق أهل اللغة، والولي بمعني الأولي بالتصرف المرادف للخليفة

The exegetes of the Qur'ān and the scholars of ḥadīth from the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah all concur that it was revealed regarding 'Alī when, amidst a group of the Ṣaḥābah, he gave his ring as charity to a poor person whilst performing ṣalāh. This narration is recorded in the six authentic books.² 'إنا' gives off the meaning of restriction according to the linguists and 'Walī' in this context is in the meaning of the most deserving of administration which is synonymous to an Imām and a Khalīfah.³

As you will notice, the Shī'ah in substantiating their position have taken refuge in the incident which is said to be the cause of its revelation. Their evidence is thus not the verse of the Qur'ān but the incident. Now, is this incident authentic or not? And is their substantiation therefrom correct? This will become clear with the following considerations:

1. Their claim that the Ahl al-Sunnah unanimously concur that this verse was revealed regarding 'Alī عليه السلام is the most blatant of lies. The consensus

1 Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī: *Minhāj al-Karāmah* p. 148; Shibr: *Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn* 1/144; al-Zanjānī: *'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah al-Ithnay 'Ashariyyah* 1/81-82.

2 The name 'authentic books' is a false name. Because the Ahl al-Sunnah do not name all six books Ṣiḥāḥ (books which contain only empirically sound narrations). They instead call them the 'six books'. But this is not strange because the Shī'ah are known for their exaggeration especially when they have fabricated lies against Allah and his Rasūl.

3 *Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn* 1/144; *'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah al-Ithnay 'Ashariyyah* 1/81-82.

of the exegetes of the Qur'ān is that it was not revealed regarding 'Alī عليه السلام specifically, nor is it true that he gave his ring in charity whilst in ṣalāh. And the consensus of the scholars of ḥadīth is that the aforementioned incident is a fabrication.¹ Likewise the assertion that it appears in the 'six authentic books' is also a lie, for it does not appear in any of them.² Hence, after citing all the narrations which suggest that this verse was revealed regarding 'Alī عليه السلام when he gave his ring as charity, Ibn Kathīr concludes thus:

وليس يصح شيء منها بالكية لضعف أسانيدها وجهالة رجالها

None of these narrations are authentic due to them consisting of flawed chains of transmission and due to the narrators thereof being unknown persons.³

2. This proof, which the Twelvers present to support their stance, actually debunks it. Because it restricts Wilāyah to 'Alī by way of 'إنما' which negates the Imāmah of the rest of the Imāms. If they answer by averring that the restriction in the verse only applies for a specific period, i.e. the period of his rule, and does not by necessity implicate the Imāmah of the others,

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/4.

2 It is a lie which the Shī'ah are not ashamed of asserting. For it is strange that this is what is stated by some of their senior Ayatollahs in contemporary times, the likes of Shibr and al-Zanjānī, etc. So is it really unknown to them that it does not appear in the six books?

In our times there is no scarcity of catalogued ḥadīth books and lexicons which will reveal the reality (Check: 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib' in *al-Mu'jam al-Mufahras li Alfāz al-Ḥadīth* and *Kunūz al-Sunnah*. And refer to the books which are dedicated to compiling the explanatory narrations for the verses of the Qur'ān and incidents which prompted the revelation thereof like that of *al-Durr al-Manthūr* 3/104-106. Or the books which are dedicated to compiling the narrations of the six books likes that of *Jāmi' al-Uṣūl*. You will not find any ground for their evidence whatsoever. Therefore Ibn Taymiyyah states that the majority of the Ummah did not even hear this incident, nor does it feature in any of their seminal works, not the *Ṣiḥāḥ* and not the *Sunan*, not the *Jawāmi'* (comprehensive books of ḥadīth) and not the *Mu'jamāt* (lexicons of ḥadīth). It likewise does not appear in any of the canonical works. See: *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/5.

3 *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 2/76-77.

then they have concurred with the Ahl al-Sunnah who assert that general Wilāyah was restricted to him during his rule and not prior to that, i.e. during the Khilāfah of the three righteous rulers.¹

3. Allah ﷻ does not commend a person but for something that is commendable according to him, whether it be compulsory or optional; and giving charity during ṣalāh is not a commendable act according to the consensus of the scholars. Had it been commendable Rasūl Allah ﷺ would have done it, encouraged others to do it, and would have done it repeatedly. But in ṣalāh there is a different type of engagement. Giving charity to the poor can wait for another time, for it is possible for a person to do that after completing his ṣalāh. Some scholars have, as a matter of fact, opined that dispensing charity whilst in ṣalāh nullifies the ṣalāh.²
4. Even if charity is hypothetically considered permissible in ṣalāh, it would not be specific to the posture of Rukū'. So how can it be said that none except those who give charity whilst in Rukū' can be the rulers. If it said that the only reason why this specific posture is mentioned is to describe 'Alī رضي الله عنه, it can be said that 'Alī رضي الله عنه had many known and conceded characteristics, why then is he not being described with them but rather with one which—besides those who heard about it and acknowledged it—people barely know? The majority of the Ummah has not heard this incident nor does it feature in any of its reliable books.³
5. The assertion that 'Alī رضي الله عنه discharged his zakāh in ṣalāh is opposed to reality. This is because 'Alī رضي الله عنه due to being a pauper in the time of Rasūl Allah ﷺ was not liable to pay zakāh. For the zakāh of silver is only compulsory upon a person who owns the Niṣāb (minimum amount liable to payment of zakāh) whereas he did not own it at that time.

1 *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī* 6/168.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/208, 4/5.

3 *Ibid.* 4/5.

Similarly, according to many a scholars giving a ring is not good enough to absolve a person of his responsibility of paying zakāh, unless the view of zakāh being compulsory in jewellery is taken wherein one opinion is that it should be discharged from the type of jewellery owned. And even though some have given the permission to evaluate the jewellery and discharge the zakāh accordingly, but doing so in ṣalāh is impossible, for values fluctuate in different conditions.¹

6. Now that it has become clear that all the narrations which they use to interpret the verse are flawed in their content and chains of transmission, the conclusion is that they cannot elicit evidence therefrom. Rather the verse is evidence against them. Because it orders the believers to establish relationships of fealty with the believers and prohibits them from doing so with the disbelievers,² an injunction unknown to the Shī'ah (as their history and legacy records).

This is obvious from the context wherein this verse features; prior to this verse Allah ﷻ says:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَتَّخِذُوا الْيَهُودَ وَالنَّصَارَىٰ أَوْلِيَاءَ بَعْضُهُمْ أَوْلِيَاءُ بَعْضٍ وَمَنْ يَتَوَلَّهُمْ مِنْكُمْ
فَإِنَّهُ مِنْهُمْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَهْدِي الْقَوْمَ الظَّالِمِينَ

O you who have believed, do not take the Jews and the Christians as allies. They are [in fact] allies of one another. And whoever is an ally to them among you—then indeed, he is [one] of them. Indeed, Allah guides not the wrongdoing people.³

This is an emphatic prohibition of allying with the Jews and the Christians and having cordial relationships with them, and according to everyone

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/5.

2 Even though the incident which prompted the revelation of this verse is specific. But the generality of the words is what is headed, not the specific incident of revelation.

3 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 51.

(including the Shī'ah) this does not imply *Wilāyah* in the meaning of leadership, for there is no room for that. Allah ﷻ then mentions those with whom one should have alliance, i.e. Allah, His Rasūl, and the believers. Hence the alliance which was negated in the previous verse is the very alliance which the believers are ordered with in this verse based on the rule of juxtaposition which is an accepted rule in the Arabic language.

Al-Rāzī mentions:

لما نهى الله في الآيات المتقدمة عن موالاة الكفار أمر في هذه الآية بموالاة من تجب موالاته

Allah ﷻ in the previous verse prohibited alliance with the disbelievers and in this verse ordered alliance with those with whom fealty is necessary.¹

Ibn Taymiyah likewise mentions:

إنه من المعلوم عند أهل التفسير خلفا عن سلف أن هذه الآية نزلت في النهي عن موالاة الكفار الأمر بموالاة المؤمنين

According to the early exegetes and those who succeeded them it is a well-known and established aspect that this verse was revealed regarding the prohibition of allying with the disbelievers and the order of allying with the believers.²

7. Averring that 'Your ally is none but...' refers to leadership does not tie up with what follows it, i.e. 'Your ally is none but Allah, His Messenger, and those who have faith...' This is because Allah ﷻ is not described as being the governor of his servants and their ruler, because He is their Creator, Sustainer, Lord and Owner; to Him belongs creation and order; it

1 *Tafsīr al-Fakhr al-Rāzī* 12/25.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/5.

cannot be said that Allah is *Amīr al-Mu'minīn* in the like manner that 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ or anyone else is accorded that title.¹ As for *Walāyah*, translated as love—the opposite of enmity, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى can be described as the One who befriends His believing bondsmen, as One who loves them and they love Him, as One who is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him, and as One who declares war against a person who harasses any of His friends.² This is the correct purport of this verse.³

Furthermore, the description 'and they bow in worship' means that they are humble before their Lord and they are subservient to His orders. The word '*Rukū*' literally means humility. The verse would thus mean that they establish *ṣalāh* and discharge *zakāh* with humility and subservience.⁴

8. The difference between *Wilāyah* (with the kasrah) and *Walāyah* (with the Fathah) is obvious in the Arabic language. The latter (*Walāyah*) is the opposite of enmity. This is the one mentioned in these verses; not the former (*Wilāyah*) which means leadership. The *Shī'ah*, however, thanks to their ignorance, do not differentiate between the two despite it being obvious:

1 In fact, even Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ cannot be described as the ruler of the believers and their governor, for his status is beyond that. Even Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq was, during his reign, only called Khalīfat Rasūl Allāh (the successor of Rasūl Allāh). The first person to be called Amīr al-Mu'minīn was 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb (*Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/9.)

2 This friendship, unlike the friendship of humans which is based upon need, is His mercy upon us. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

وَقُلِ الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ الَّذِي لَمْ يَتَّخِذْ وَلَدًا وَلَمْ يَكُنْ لَهُ شَرِيكٌ فِي الْمُلْكِ وَلَمْ يَكُنْ لَهُ وَلِيٌّ مِنَ الذُّلِّ وَكَبْرَهُ تَكْبِيرًا

And say, "Praise to Allah, who has not taken a son and has had no partner in [His] dominion and has no [need of a] protector out of weakness; and glorify Him with [great] glorification."

So Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى does not befriend any one out of weakness. Instead he says:

مَنْ كَانَ يُرِيدُ الْعِزَّةَ فَلِلَّهِ الْعِزَّةُ جَمِيعًا

Whoever desires honour [through power] – then to Allah belongs all honour (Fāṭir: 10) (*Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/9).

3 Ibid.

4 Al-Zamakhsharī: *Al-Kashshāf* 1/624; *Tafsīr al-Rāzī* 12/25.

- *Walā'* (with a Faṭḥah) is the opposite of enmity; the nouns *Mawlā* and *Walī* (friend) are derived therefrom.
- And *Wilāyah* is with a Kasrah wherefrom the knowns *Wālī* and *Mutawallī* (ruler/governor) are derived.¹

The jurists have, therefore, mentioned that if the *Wālī* (ruler) and the *Walī* (family member) happen to be at the funeral of a deceased person, the latter will take precedence over the former. This also shows that both the words are different.²

If Allah ﷻ intended *Wilāyah* (leadership) then He would have phrased the verse thus:

إنما يتولي عليكم...

None can rule over you but...

In conclusion, this verse is about the alliance which the believers should have for each other,³ which is why the plural form, “and those who have believed,” is brought in the verse.

If this is the reality of their strongest argument, then it is obvious that they have no basis whatsoever for what they claim. The magnanimity of this doctrine, which according to the Shī'ah is the most crucial aspect of their dogma, necessarily requires evidence which is unequivocal and to the point which all classes of people are able to comprehend, a layman should be able to understand it as clearly as a scholar is able to grasp it, the later generations should be able to understand it as the earlier generations were able to understand it and the Bedouins should be able to understand it like the people of the cities are able to understand it. But, such evidence is not found in the Book of Allah ﷻ. This clearly suggests that there was no *Naṣṣ* (emphatic appointment) as they allege. Whereas the Qur'ān

1 Al-Maqdisī: *Risālāh fī al-Radd 'Alā al-Rāfiḍah* p. 220-221; *Mukhtār al-Ṣiḥāḥ* (under the roots letters و ي).

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/8.

3 Ibid. also refer to *Tafsīr al-Rāzī* 12/25; *Tafsīr al-Ālūsī* 6/167.

was revealed in the clear Arabic language this verse and the others verses which they use in substantiation do not contain expressions and words which are used in the Arabic language for emphatic appointment.

So where can the Shī'ah go henceforth? Either toward renouncing the Qur'ān which is tantamount to renouncing Islam or toward shunning their extremism and fanaticism and return to the truth which is what they are required to do.

Besides this verse there are other verses as well which they present in support of their position. They have been documented by Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī and Ibn Taymiyyah has responded to them comprehensively.¹ Any person who refers to their books of tafsīr and ḥadīth will notice that they have made *Wilāyah* and the Imāms the central theme of the Qur'ān, as has passed already in this book, which is a sign of their helplessness in this regard.

From this discussion it has become evident that the apparent wording of the Qur'ān does not accommodate the emphatic appointment of 'Alī عليه السلام and the remaining Imāms. They thus avert the meanings of the verses which they use according to their whims and fancies based on fabricated narrations and invalid interpretations. So in reality they do not derive evidence from the Qur'ān itself, but from narrations. Hence, their claim that they derive evidence from the Qur'ān is an empty claim which has no reality.

Their evidence from the Sunnah

The Shī'ah have primarily taken the virtues and merits of 'Alī عليه السلام which appear in the books of ḥadīth of the Ahl al-Sunnah and used them to prove his explicit nomination. It should be noted that *Faḍā'il* (merits) is a topic wherein fabrication is not unusual. And it is said that the Shī'ī are the forerunners in forging narrations in this regard. Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd mentions:

1 Professor 'Alī al-Sālūs has done a comprehensive study of verses of the Qur'ān which they use for substantiating the doctrine of Imāmah in his books *al-Imāmah 'ind al-Ja'fariyyah wa al-Adillah min al-Qur'ān al-'Aẓīm*. He has concluded that all their proofs are related to incidents which prompted the revelation of verses of the Qur'ān which are not reliable enough to prove as evidence for their doctrine.

Forgeries in the topic of Faḍā'il have all come from the Shī'ah.¹

That is why you will find more forgeries in the merits of 'Alī عليه السلام than in the merits of the remaining three Khulafā'.

However, the narrations which mention the merits of 'Alī عليه السلام do not in any way contain words or expressions of his explicit nomination and the bequest of his succession. Not according to the Arabic language, not according to the conventions of the Arabs, not according to the Sharī'ah of Islam, and not according to the understanding of the intellectuals. They are just mere merits which the Shī'ah have exploited to support their stance. Ibn Ḥazm after doing a comprehensive study of the virtues of 'Alī عليه السلام asserts thus:

و أما الذي صح من فضائل علي فهو قول النبي صلي الله عليه وسلم: أنت مني بمنزلة هارون من موسى إلا أنه لا نبي بعدي وهذا لا حجة فيه للرافضة وقوله عليه السلام: لأعطين الراية غدا رجلا يحب الله ورسوله، ويحبه الله ورسوله وهذه صفة واجبة لكل مسلم وفاضل وعهده عليه السلام: أن عليا لا يحبه إلا مؤمن ولا يبغضه إلا منافق وقد صح مثل هذا في الأنصار- رضي الله عنهم- أنه لا يبغضهم من يؤمن بالله و اليوم الآخر و أما من كنت مولاه فعلي مولاه، فلا يصح من طريق الثقات أصلا. و أما سائر الأحاديث التي تتعلق بها الرافضة فموضوعة، يعرف ذلك من له أدني علم بالأخبار ونقلتها

As for the virtues of 'Alī, the only narrations which are authentically proven are, "You are to me like how Hārūn was to Mūsā. However, there is no Nabī after me."² This narration does not hold any evidence for the

1 *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* 2/134 (taken from *al-Sunnah wa Makānatuhā fī al-Tashrī' al-Islāmī* p. 76).

2 The complete narration of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* states that when Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم left for Tabūk he told 'Alī to take charge over Madīnah. 'Alī asked him, "Are you leaving me behind with the children and women?" Whereupon Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم said, "Does it not please you, O 'Alī, that you be to me as Hārūn was to Mūsā, however, there is no Nabī to come after me." (*Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: Chapter Regarding the Campaigns: Sub-chapter Regarding the Battle of Tabūk: 8/12; see also: *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: Chapter Regarding the Campaigns: Sub-chapter Regarding the Battle of Tabūk: 2/1870; *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*: Chapter of Virtues: 5/640-641; *Sunan Ibn Mājah*: Introductory Chapter: 1/42-43; *Musnad Aḥmad* 1/170, 173, 174, 175, 177, 179, 182, 184, 185, 330; 3/32, 338; 6/369, 438.

Shī'ah.¹ And the narration, "Tomorrow I will give the flag to a person who

1 In expounding upon this Ibn Ḥazm says, "This does not prove his superiority upon the others and does not establish his leadership after Rasūl Allah ﷺ. Because Hārūn عليه السلام did not take charge of the affairs of the Banī Isrā'īl after Mūsā عليه السلام, rather it was his assistant and companion Yūsha' ibn Nūn, who accompanied him on his journey to meet Khidār عليه السلام, who took charge of affairs after him. In a like manner, after Rasūl Allah ﷺ his companion in the cave and on the journey of *Hijrah* (migration) was the one who succeeded him.

Hence, considering the fact that 'Alī was not a Nabī like Hārūn عليه السلام and the fact that Hārūn did not succeed his brother Mūsā عليه السلام after his demise, the only appropriate purport of the ḥadīth would be that he was to Rasūl Allah ﷺ as Hārūn عليه السلام was to Mūsā in kinship.

Furthermore, Rasūl Allah ﷺ said this to him when he appointed him as his deputy over Madīnah during the battle of Tabūk. Whereupon the hypocrites remarked, "Rasūl Allah ﷺ regarded him as inferior" (this is the text which appears in the revised version of his *al-Faṣl*. Maybe it ought to be 'regarded him as a burden'). Hence, 'Alī رضي الله عنه subsequent to that caught up with Rasūl Allah ﷺ and complained to him. Rasūl Allah ﷺ told him, "You are to me as Hārūn was to Mūsā." That is, he meant to say that I have not appointed you as my deputy considering you to be a burden, but I have done so willingly.

In addition, it should be noted that Rasūl Allah ﷺ had, prior to the Battle of Tabūk and thereafter, appointed many other Ṣaḥābah besides 'Alī رضي الله عنه as his deputies over Madīnah. So this specific incident does not entail any merit which 'Alī رضي الله عنه alone enjoys. Nor does it necessitate that he was the only one deserving of rulership after him. For if this phenomenon, leadership, was not true for the others, then so too was it not true for 'Alī. (*Al-Faṣl* 4/159-160).

Similarly, likening 'Alī to Hārūn عليه السلام is not in any way more virtuous than likening Abū Bakr to Ibrāhīm and 'Isā عليه السلام, and likening 'Umar to Nūḥ and Mūsā عليه السلام, as is narrated in *Musnad Ahmad* 1/383, *Mustadrak Ḥākim* 3/21-22 and *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*: Chapter Regarding Jihad: 4/213. This is due to the fact that these four Ambiyā' were definitely much more virtuous than Hārūn عليه السلام. And Abū Bakr and 'Umar رضي الله عنه are likened not just to one prophet but to two. This simile is thus superior to the simile of 'Alī رضي الله عنه. More so when the merit of appointment as deputy was not enjoyed by 'Alī رضي الله عنه alone, but by others besides him as well whereas Abū Bakr and 'Umar رضي الله عنه had no partners in the merits owing to which they were likened to the other prophets. Hence appointing him was not a merit exclusive to him and nor was likening him to a Nabī in just some aspects exclusive to him (*al-Muntaqā* p. 314-315).

Also refer to: *Sharḥ al-Nawawī 'alā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 15/174; Abū Nu'aym: *al-Imāmah wa al-Radd 'alā al-Rāfiḍah* p. 221-222; *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/87; *al-Muntaqā* p. 212, 213, 311, 314; *Faṭḥ al-Bārī* 7/74; *al-Maqdisī*: *Al-Radd 'alā al-Rāfiḍah* p. 201-208; *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* p. 163-164; *al-Sālūs*: *al-Imāmah 'ind al-Ja'fariyyah fī Daw' al-Sunnah* p. 23-24, etc.

loves Allah and his Rasūl and Allah and his Rasūl love him.”¹ Which is a quality required of every devout Muslim.² And the statement of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, “‘Alī, only a believer will love him and only a hypocrite will hate him.”³ But this type of virtue is proven for the Anṣār as well. Rasūl Allah ﷺ said that only a person who believes in Allah and the Last Day will love them.⁴ As for the narration, “Whosoever’s *mawlā* I am ‘Alī is also his *mawlā*.”⁵ It is not transmitted through reliable narrators at all. And as to the remaining narrations which the Shī‘ah use, they are forgeries which any person who has a little knowledge regarding ḥadīth can identify.⁶

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: Chapter Regarding the Virtues of the Ṣaḥābah: Sub-chapter Regarding the Merits of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib: 7/70; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: Chapter Regarding the Virtues of the Ṣaḥābah: Sub-chapter Regarding the Merits of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib: 2/1871-1873.

2 Meaning, this description does not fit ‘Alī رضي الله عنه only, because others besides him also love Allah and his Rasūl and Allah and His Rasūl Allah love them in return. The narration, however, is just a testification of his loyalty, which is akin to the glad tidings of Jannah which Rasūl Allah ﷺ gave to the ten Ṣaḥābah. So this again is not a merit exclusive to him, let alone it being evidence for his explicit nomination after Rasūl Allah ﷺ and his infallibility.

Furthermore, The Shī‘ah who claim that all the Ṣaḥābah turned apostate after the demise of Rasūl Allah ﷺ cannot hold this narration in their favour. This is because the Khawārij who rebelled against ‘Alī considered him to be an apostate as well. Al-Ash‘arī states, “The Khawārij are unanimous regarding the disbelief of ‘Alī (*al-Maqālāt* 1/167). The Ahl al-Sunnah have, however, refuted this allegation of the Khawārij with abundant evidence which comprehensively asserts that (together with ‘Alī) the first three Khulafā’ were also Muslims. (*Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/98-99).

3 *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*: Chapter of Merits: 5/643. Imām Tirmidhī has rated the ḥadīth as Ṣaḥīḥ and Ḥasan (authentic and good).

4 Rasūl Allah ﷺ is reported to have said, “A person who has faith in Allah and the Last Day will never despise the Anṣār (*Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: Chapter Regarding Īmān: Sub-chapter Regarding Love for the Anṣār Being a Proof of Īmān and a Sign thereof, and Hate for them Being a Sign of Hypocrisy: 1/86). There are other narrations as well wherein the wording is identical to that of the narration regarding ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. Rasūl Allah ﷺ said, “The Anṣār, only a believer will love them and only a hypocrite will despise them.” (*Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: Chapter Regarding the Virtues of the Anṣār: Sub-chapter Regarding Love for the Anṣār Being a Sign of Īmān: 7/113; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: previously mentioned details; *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*: Chapter of Merits: Sub-chapter Regarding the Virtues of the Anṣār and the Quraysh: 5/712).

5 Details will come ahead.

6 *Al-Faṣl* 4/224.

Ibn Taymiyah has cited this text of Ibn Ḥazm and commented thus:

فَأَنْ قِيلَ لَمْ يَذْكُرْ ابْنُ حَزْمٍ مَا فِي الصَّحِيحَيْنِ مِنْ قَوْلِهِ أَنْتَ مِنِّي وَأَنَا مِنْكَ وَحَدِيثِ الْمَبَاهِلَةِ وَالْكَسَاءِ قِيلَ
مَقْصُودُ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ الَّذِي فِي الصَّحِيحِ مِنَ الْحَدِيثِ الَّذِي لَا يَذْكُرُ فِيهِ إِلَّا عَلِيٌّ، وَأَمَّا تِلْكَ فِيهَا ذِكْرُ غَيْرِهِ، فَإِنَّهُ
قَالَ لَجَعْفَرٍ: أَشْبَهْتَ خَلْقِي وَخَلْقِي قَالَ لَزَيْدٍ: أَنْتَ أَخُونَا وَمَوْلَانَا، وَحَدِيثِ الْمَبَاهِلَةِ وَالْكَسَاءِ فِيهِمَا ذِكْرُ
عَلِيٍّ، وَفَاطِمَةَ، وَحَسَنَ، وَحُسَيْنَ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ فَلَا يَرُدُّ هَذَا عَلَيَّ ابْنِ حَزْمٍ

If it is said that Ibn Ḥazm did not mention the narrations which appear in the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* like, “I am from you and you are from me.”¹, the narration of *Mubāhalah* (mutual imprecation)², and the narration of *Kisāʾ* (the shawl)³, the answer is that Ibn Ḥazm only intended to respond to those authentic

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (with the commentary *Fath al-Bārī*): chapter regarding settling arguments: 5/303-304, chapter of wars: sub-chapter regarding the ‘*Umrah al-Qaḍāʾ*’ 7/499.

2 The narration of Sa’d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ wherein he says, “...When the verse:

قُلْ نَعَالُوا نَدْعُ أَبْنَاءَنَا وَأَبْنَاءَكُمْ

Come, let us call our sons and your sons... (Āl ‘Imrān: 61)

was revealed, Rasūl Allāh ﷺ called ‘Alī, Fāṭimah, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn and said, “O Allāh this is my household.” (*Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter regarding the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah; sub-chapter regarding the merits of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib: 2/1871).

This ḥadīth does not entail any evidence for the Imāmah of ‘Alī or his superiority, for immediate family is one of the requirements of *Mubāhalah*. Hence entering the *Mubāhalah* with those who were not related to him would not have served the purpose in spite of them being more virtuous than ‘Alī ﷺ (See: *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/34-36; al-Maqdisī: *Risālah fī al-Radd ‘alā al-Rawāfiḍ* p. 243-245.

3 This narration appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. ‘Ā’ishah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا reports that Rasūl Allāh ﷺ one day came out. He was wearing a coloured shawl (a shawl which usually had the print of camel-men) which was made of black hair. Subsequently, Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī came, he took him under the shawl. Then Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī came, he also came into the shawl. Thereafter Fāṭimah came, he took her under it as well. She was followed by ‘Alī who was also taken therein. Subsequent to that he said,

إِنَّمَا يُرِيدُ اللَّهُ لِيُذْهِبَ عَنْكُمُ الرِّجْسَ أَهْلَ الْبَيْتِ وَيُطَهِّرَكُمْ تَطْهِيرًا

“O household! Allāh intends to remove from you the impurity (of sin) and to purify you with intensive purification.” (al-Aḥzāb: 33)

(*Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter regarding the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah: sub-chapter regarding the merits of the Ahl al-Bayt: 2/1883; *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/20-25; *Risālah fī al-Radd ‘alā al-Rāfiḍah* p. 246; *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* p. 155-156).

narrations which contain the exclusive mention of ‘Alī. As for these narrations, they contain his mention with the mention of others; in the first narration Rasūl Allah ﷺ said to Ja‘far, “You resemble me in my features and my character.” And he said to Zayd, “You are our brother and our friend.” And in both the *Mubāhalah* and *Kisā’* narrations, along with ‘Alī, mention is made of Fāṭimah, Ḥasan, and Husayn. So Ibn Ḥazm is free of the objection.¹

The Shī‘ah have, nonetheless, exceeded all limits in this regard. They have invented narrations and have likewise made false additions to authentic ones. The books dedicated to forgeries have documented a good amount of these narrations of the Shī‘ah.² Ibn al-Jawzī mentions:

فضائله-يعني عليا- الصحيحة كثيرة غير أن الرافضة لم تقنع، فوضعت له ما يضع ولا يرفع

The authentic merits of ‘Alī are numerous. However, the Shī‘ah were not satisfied, so they fabricated more narrations; narrations which denigrate him instead of venerating him.³

Many a time they deceitfully and falsely attribute some of these narrations to the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah whereas you will not find any trace of them whatsoever. Ibn Taymiyah therefore says:

و رأيت كثيرا من ذلك المعزو الذي عزاه أولئك (يعني بهم شيوخ الروافض الذين اطلع علي كتبهم) الي المسند و الصحيحين و غيرهما باطلا لا حقيقة له

Many a times I have found their attribution of many of these narrations to the *Musnad* and the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, etc., to be false and without any reality.⁴

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/86.

2 Ibn al-Jawzī: *al-Mawḍū‘āt* 1/338.

3 Ibid. 1/338..

4 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/27.

These narrations, which they cite as proof, have been compiled by Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī. And Ibn Taymiyah has very conclusively separated the truth from the falsehood in responding to them.¹

Nonetheless, the Shī'ah have their deceitful and cunning ploys through the medium of which they endeavour to derive evidence from the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Perhaps the first person to expose these ploys was the great scholar of India Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Dehlawī in his book *Tuḥfah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah*.² Shaykh Muḥammad Naṣr Allah al-Hindī al-Makkī, the teacher of the scholars and luminaries, a man unique and unparalleled in his knowledge, as al-Ālūsī describes him, has likewise done the same in his book *al-Ṣawāqī' al-Muḥriqah* which Al-Ālūsī has condensed and titled *al-Suyūf al-Mushriqah*.³ Another scholar who has done work in this regard is al-Shaykh al-Suwaydī who has written *Naqḍ 'Aqā'id al-Shī'ah*.⁴ And I have mentioned some of these ploys in my book *Fikrah al-Taqrīb*⁵ so there is no need to repeat them here.

Having said this, I will now mention their strongest evidence from the Sunnah just as I had previously mentioned their strongest evidence from the Qur'ān.

Their Strongest Evidence from the Sunnah

Their strongest evidence from the Sunnah is '*Ḥadīth al-Ghadr*'. The importance that the Shī'ah lend to this ḥadīth can be gaged from the fact that one of their

1 Especially in the last volume. Professor 'Alī al-Sālūs has likewise compiled all the narrations which appear in the six books, the *Muwatta'* and the *Musnad* of Imām Aḥmad and has done a comprehensive study of their wording and chains of transmission. He has concluded with the remarks that the Sunnah does not support the stance of the Ja'fariyyah in the issue of Imāmah, rather the opposite is true, for many an authentic narrations debunk it (see: *al-Imāmah 'ind al-Ja'fariyyah fī Ḍaw' al-Sunnah*).

2 *Tuḥfah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* p. 44 onwards; *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* p. 32 onwards.

3 See: *al-Suyūf al-Mushriqah* and *Mukhtaṣar al-Ṣawāqī'* p. 50 onwards.

4 *Naqḍ 'Aqā'id al-Shī'ah* (manuscript wherein the pages have not been numbered as yet. But it is the 25th page from the beginning.)

5 *Fikrah al-Taqrīb* p. 52 onwards.

contemporary scholars has written a book comprising of sixteen volumes named, *Ghadīr in the Qur’ān, the Sunnah, and Arabic literature*. They aver that Rasūl Allah ﷺ, upon reaching Ghadīr Khum¹ on his return from the Farewell Ḥajj told the people that ‘Alī رضي الله عنه is his successor and the ruler after him. For Allah سبحانه وتعالى ordered him in the Qur’ān:

يَا أَيُّهَا الرَّسُولُ بَلِّغْ مَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكَ مِنْ رَبِّكَ وَإِنْ لَمْ تَفْعَلْ فَمَا بَلَغْتَ رِسَالَتَهُ

O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you from your Lord, and if you do not, then you have not conveyed His message.²

Al-Majlisī after citing a hundred and five such narrations³ avers:

إنا و مخالفينا قد رويناه عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أنه قام يوم غدیر خم وقد جمع المسلمون فقال: أيها الناس أأستأولي بالمؤمنين من أنفسهم؟ فقالوا: بلي، قال صلى الله عليه وآله من كنت مولاه فعلي مولاه اللهم وال من والاه، و عاد من عاداه، وانصر من نصره، واخذل من خذله

We and our opponents concur that when Rasūl Allah ﷺ reached Ghadīr Khum he addressed the people saying, “O people! Am I not closer to the believers than themselves?” they responded, “Most certainly.” Whereupon Rasūl Allah ﷺ said, “Whosoever’s *mawlā* I am ‘Alī is his *mawlā*.⁴ O Allah befriend the one who befriends him, oppose the one who opposes him, help the one who helps him and abandon the one who abandons him.”⁵

Their books of Qur’ānic exegesis similarly quote this narration in establishing his Imāmah under the commentary of the aforecited verse. Likewise, all their

1 Khum is a valley between Makkah and Madinah by Juḥfah. There, there is a pond which is known for its squalidity (*Mu’jam al-Buldān* 2/389).

2 Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 67.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 37/108-253.

4 The word ‘mawlā’ has many meanings in the Arabic language. In this context the Shī’ah translate it as ‘master’, ‘Imām’ and ‘leader’ and the Ahl al-Sunnah translate it as ‘friend’ and ‘associate’.

5 Ibid. 37/225.

books which discuss the issue of Imāmah cite it as well.¹ This narration takes the foremost position among all their narrations which they present against the Ahl al-Sunnah. Their scholar ‘Abd Allah Shibr says:

ما روي العامة لأسرهم بطرق متواترة و أسانيد متضافرة تنيف علي مائة طريق و اتفقوا علي صحته و اعترفوا بوقوعه و هو حديث الغدير.

The narration which the commonality, the Ahl al-Sunnah, have reported with more than a hundred widespread and supportive transmissions, and upon the authenticity of which they have all agreed, and the occurrence of which they have all conceded is the incident of Ghadīr.²

Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī similarly used this narration in support of his argument which was subsequently very aptly rebutted by Ibn Taymiyyah.³ Likewise Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb also debated the stance of al-Mufid regarding the narration based on its Shī‘ī conception.⁴ Most of the scholars who have combatted the Shī‘ah have in a like manner shed light upon this narration.⁵ Hereunder I will briefly present the responses given by the Ahl al-Sunnah:

Firstly, the fabricators have added on to the actual text of the narration. And besides the statement ‘whosoever’s *mawlā* I am ‘Alī is his *mawlā*’ the rest of the

1 Ibn Muṭahhar: *Kashf al-Murād* p. 395; al-Qazwīnī: *al-Shī‘ah fī ‘Aqā’idihim* p. 71; al-Ṣādiqī: ‘Alī wa al-Ḥākimūn p. 55-76; Khalīl Yāsīn: *al-Imām ‘Alī* p. 292; al-Zanjānī: ‘Aqā’id al-Imāmiyyah al-Ithnay ‘Ashariyyah 1/90; al-Aṣṣāhānī: ‘Aqīdah al-Shī‘ah fī al-Imāmah p. 55.

2 *Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn* 1/153. Al-Ṣādiqī says, “The narration of Ghadīr is one of the most authentically established narrations transmitted by the narrators (‘Alī wa al-Ḥākimūn p. 73). It is evidence against those who were present and those who were not. So that no excuse remains for anyone after its establishment (Ibid. 73).

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/9-16, 84-87; *al-Muntaqā* p. 422-425, 466-468.

4 *Risālah fī al-Radd ‘alā al-Rāfiḍah* p. 6-7.

5 Abū Nu‘aym: *al-Imāmah wa al-Radd ‘alā al-Rāfiḍah* p. 13; al-Maqdisī: *Risālah fī al-Radd ‘alā al-Rawāfiḍ* p. 221-224; al-Ṭufailī: *al-Munāẓarah bayn Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Rāfiḍah* p. 15-16; al-Ālūsī: *Rūḥ al-Ma‘ānī* 6/192-199.

narration which follows thereafter is not authentic according to a group of scholars.¹ Whilst another group of scholars aver that the narration in its entirety is unauthentic. Ibn Ḥazm mentions:

و أما من كنت مولاه فعلي مولاه فلا يصح من طريق الثقات أصلا

And as for the narration ‘whosoever’s *mawlā* I am ‘Alī is his *mawlā*’, it is not narrated through the transmission of reliable narrators.²

Rating the narration as weak and flawed is thus narrated from Imām Bukhārī, Ibrāhīm al-Ḥarbī, and a group of scholars.³

1 Ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb: *Risālah fī al-Radd ‘alā al-Rāfiḍah* p. 13. The narration appears in *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*: Sub-chapter regarding the virtues of ‘Alī: 5/633. It states that Rasūl Allah ﷺ said:

من كنت مولاه فعلي مولاه

“Whosoever’s *mawlā* I am ‘Alī is his *mawlā*.”

Imām Tirmidhī commenting on it states that it is a Ṣaḥīḥ Ḥasan narration (authentic and good). The version of *Sunan Ibn Mājah* reads as follows: Barā’ ibn ‘Āzib narrates:

أقبلنا مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في حجته التي حج فنزل في بعض الطرق فأمر الصلاة جامعة فأخذ بيد علي وقال: ألسنت أولي بالمؤمنين من أنفسهم؟ قالوا: بلى. قال: فهذا ولي من أنا مولاه اللهم وال من والاه وعاد من عاداه.

We returned with Rasūl Allah ﷺ from his Ḥajj which he performed. He stopped on the way and ordered the people to gather for ṣalāh. He then took the hand of ‘Alī and said, “Am I not more deserving of the believers than them they are of themselves?” The people responded, “Most certainly.” He asked again, “Am I not more deserving of the believers than them they are of themselves?” To which the people responded, “Most certainly.” He then said, “Then he is the walī of the one whose *mawlā* I am. Oh Allah befriend the one who befriends him and oppose the one who opposes him.” (*Sunan Ibn Mājah* 1/43).

However, the author of *Al-Zawā’id* mentions, “The chain of transmission is weak because of the weak narrator ‘Alī ibn Zayd ibn Jad‘ān (one of the narrators of *Sunan Ibn Mājah*).” (*Al-Zawā’id* p. 69). The narration appears in *Musnad Aḥmad* 1/84. Shaykh Aḥmad Shākir commenting thereupon mentions, “The text of the narration is authentic. It is established in many variant ways most of which are documented in *Majma’ Al-Zawā’id*.” (See: *al-Musnad* 2/56 –with the revision of Shākir; *Majma’ Al-Zawā’id* 9/103-109).

2 Ibn Ḥazm: *al-Faṣl* 4/224; see: *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/86; al-Dhahabī: *al-Muntaqā (Mukhtaṣar Minhāj al-Sunnah)* p. 467.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/86.

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

وأما قوله: من كنت مولاه فعلي مولاه فليس هو في الصحاح، لكن هو مما رواه أهل العلم و تنازع الناس في صحته و أما قوله: اللهم وال من والاه و عاد من عاداه و انصر من نصره و اخذل من خذله فهو كذب باتفاق أهل المعرفة بالحديث

As for his statement, “Whosoever’s *mawlā* I am ‘Alī is his *mawlā*”, it does not appear in the authentic books of ḥadīth. It is rather an addition which the scholars have transmitted and debated.¹ And as for his supplication, “O Allah befriend the one who befriends him, oppose the one who opposes him, help the one who helps him, and forsake the one who forsakes him”, it is a lie according to the consensus of the scholars of ḥadīth.²

He further goes on to mention that a forgery can be identified by merely looking at its text. He explains:

لأن قوله اللهم انصر من نصره خلاف للواقع التاريخي الثابت فلا يصح عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أصلاً و أما قوله اللهم وال من والاه و عاد من عاداه فهو مخالف لأصل الإسلام، فإن القرآن قد بين أن المؤمنين إخوة مع قتالهم و بغى بعضهم علي بعض

The supplication, “O Allah help the one who helps him,” is not harmonious with historical reality and therefore cannot be the supplication of Rasūl Allah ﷺ.³ Likewise the supplication, “O Allah befriend the one who befriends him and oppose the one who opposes him,” is against the primary text of Islam, the Qur’ān, which states that the believers are brothers despite their internal wars and transgressions against each other.⁴

1 Ibid.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/16.

3 Because many people fought by his side in the Battle of Šifīn but still did not attain victory and many people did not fight by his side but were not forsaken by Allah. For example: Sa’d who conquered Iraq did not fight with ‘Alī. Similarly, the army of Mu’āwiyah and the Umayyads, despite fighting against him, conquered many cities of the disbelievers with the help of Allah (*Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 4/418).

4 Ibid.

Secondly, Ibn Taymiyyah, after mentioning the variant views of the scholars regarding the authenticity of the statement, “Whosoever’s *mawlā* I am ‘Alī is his *mawlā*,” states:

إن لم يكن النبي صلي الله عليه وسلم قاله فلا كلام، فإن قاله فلم يرد به قطعاً الخلافة بعده، إذ ليس في اللفظ ما يدل عليه، وهذا الأمر العظيم يجب أن يبلغ بلاغاً مبيناً.. والموالاتة ضد المعاداة. وهذا حكم ثابت لكل مؤمن، فعلي رضي الله عنه من المؤمنين الذين يتولون المؤمنين ويتولونه، وفي هذا الحديث إثبات إيمان علي في الباطن، والشهادة له بأنه يستحق الموالاتة باطناً وظاهراً، ويرد ما يقوله فيه أعداؤه من الخوارج والنواصب، ولكن ليس فيه أنه ليس من المؤمنين مولى غيره، فكيف ورسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم له موال و هم صالحوا المؤمنين

If this was not the statement of Rasūl Allah ﷺ then there is no debate. But, hypothetically, even if it is, he did not intend to appoint ‘Alī as the Khalīfah after him. Because the wording of the narration does not accommodate that, more so when this is a pivotal issue which requires unequivocal and emphatic expression. *Muwālāt* in this narration is thus the opposite of enmity which is established for every Muslim. Which implies that ‘Alī عليه السلام is a believer from among the believers who befriend each other and befriend him as well. The narration, however, is a testification to the internal faith of ‘Alī عليه السلام and to the fact that he is deserving of friendship inwardly and outwardly; it is thus a refutation of what the Khawārij and the Nawāṣib, his enemies, accuse him of. But it does not in any way suggest that there is no master/leader for the believers besides him. Why would that be the situation when Rasūl Allah ﷺ had many other *Mawālī* besides him, i.e. the pious believers?¹

Al-Fīroz’ābādī, the author of *Al-Qāmūs* mentions:

و أما ما يظنه من يظن من الراضية أن في الآية أو في الحديث دلالة علي أن علياً رضي الله عنه هو الخليفة بعد النبي صلي الله عليه وسلم فمن الجهل المقطوع بخطأ صاحبه فإن الولاية بالفتح هي ضد العداوة، والاسم منها مولى، وولي، والولاية بكسر الواو هي الإمارة، والاسم منها والي و متولي.. والموالاتة ضد المعاداة وهي من الطرفين كقوله تعالى: وَإِنْ تَظَاهَرَا عَلَيْهِ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ هُوَ مَوْلَاهُ وَجِبْرِيلُ وَصَالِحُ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/86.

وَالْمَلَائِكَةُ بَعْدَ ذَلِكَ ظَهِيرٌ وَقَالَ: ذَلِكَ بِأَنَّ اللَّهَ مَوْلَى الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَأَنَّ الْكَافِرِينَ لَا مَوْلَى لَهُمْ وَقَالَ تَعَالَى:
وَالْمُؤْمِنُونَ وَالْمُؤْمِنَاتُ بَعْضُهُمْ أَوْلِيَاءُ بَعْضٍ

And as for the assumption of the Shī'ah that the verse¹ or the narration is evidence that 'Alī is the Khalīfah after Rasūl Allah ﷺ, it is the result of ignorance which is wrong with a doubt. Because *Walāyah* with a Faṭḥah is the opposite of enmity and the nouns derived therefrom are, *Mawlā* and *Walī*. And *Wilāyah* with a Kasrah means leadership and the nouns derived therefrom are *Wālī* and *Mutawallī*. Hence *Muwālāt* (affinity) is the opposite of *Mu'ādāt* (enmity) and it is reciprocal, as in the verse, "But if you cooperate against him – then indeed Allah is his friend, and Gabriel and the righteous of the believers. And the angels, moreover, are [his] assistants,"² the verse, "That is because Allah is the Protector of those who have believed and because the disbelievers have no protector." And the verse,³ "The believing men and believing women are allies of one another." There are many verse of this nature.⁴

Ostensibly, the Shī'ah realised that this narration does not serve their purpose. They thus made many additions to it.

Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb averred that many of these additions are tantamount to disbelieve according to the entire Ummah. If a person reads these additions from the *Biḥār* of al-Majlisī he will see open disbelief and deviance. Such that can only be explained and elaborated upon in lengthy pages. Just looking at the texts thereof is enough to determine that they are forgeries.⁵

Thirdly, Sharī'ah aside, it is a known fact in terms of language, reason and public convention that appointment of a Khalīfah cannot be valid with such ambiguous

1 Referring to the verse وإنا وإنا وليكم الله ورسوله... Refer to the previous discussion on p. 922

2 Sūrah al-Taḥrīm: 4.

3 Sūrah Muḥammad: 11.

4 See *al-Mu'jam al-Mufahras*: under the root letters walī.

5 *Risālah fī al-Radd 'alā al-Rāfiḍah* p. 6 onwards.

words. Therefore, when Ḥasan ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib was asked, “Did not Rasūl Allah ﷺ say, “Whosoever’s *mawlā* I am ‘Alī is his *mawlā*.” He replied thus:

ألم يقل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لعلي من كنت مولاه فعلي مولاه؟ فقال: أما والله إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إن كان يعني الإمرة والسلطان والقيام علي الناس بعده لأفصح لهم بذلك، كما أفصح لهم بالصلاة والزكاة وصيام رمضان وحج البيت، ولقال لهم: إن هذا ولي أمركم من بعدي فاسمعوا له وأطيعوا فما كان من وراء هذا شيء، فإن أنصح الناس بالمسلمين رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

Behold! By the oath of Allah! If Rasūl Allah’s ﷺ intended purpose was leadership over the people and successorship after him he would have made that clear to them in no uncertain terms. Just as he clarified ṣalāh, zakāh, fasting in Ramaḍān and Hajj for them; he would have said, “This is the person in charge of your affairs after me so listen to him and obey him.” In this statement, which Rasūl Allah ﷺ would more likely have said due to him being the best well-wisher for the Muslims, there would have been no ambiguity whatsoever.¹

The purport of the narration is general for every believer. But the reason why ‘Alī رضي الله عنه is specifically mentioned is that some of his fellow companions were disillusioned with him. They continuously complained of him to Rasūl Allah ﷺ before he left Madīnah when he sent him to Yemen during the Farewell Hajj.² Imām al-Bayhaqī therefore says:

ليس فيه إن صح إسناده نص علي ولاية علي بعده فقد ذكرنا من طرقه في كتاب الفضائل ما دل علي مقصود النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم من ذلك، وهو أنه لما بعثه إلي اليمن كثر الشكاية عنه وأظهروا بغضه، فاراد النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أن يذكر اختصاصه به ومحبة إياه ويحتمل بذلك علي محبته وموالاته وترك معاداته فقال: من كنت وليه فعلي وليه، وفي بعض الروايات من كنت مولاه فعلي مولاه والمراد به ولاء الإسلام ومودته. وعلي المسلمين أن يوالي بعضهم بعضا ولا يعادي بعضهم بعضا

1 Al-Bayhaqī: *Al-ʿItiqād* p. 182-183. See also: *Tahdhīb Tārīkh Dimashq* 4/169; Abū Ḥāmid al-Maqdisī: *Risālah fī al-Radd ‘alā al-Rāfiḍah* p. 222-223.

2 *Sīrah Ibn Hishām* 2/603; *al-Bidāyah wa Al-Nihāyah* 5/104-105.

Even if the narration is regarded authentic it does not yield any evidence for the leadership of ‘Alī after Rasūl Allah ﷺ, for in the chapter of merits we have mentioned through his transmission the reason owing to which Rasūl Allah ﷺ made exclusive mention of him. That is, when he sent him to Yemen, many people were disillusioned with him and they expressed hatred for him. So Rasūl Allah ﷺ remedying the situation informed them that ‘Alī is his bosom friend and enjoys his admiration thereby encouraging them to love him and befriend him, which is why he said, “Whoever’s walī I am ‘Alī is his walī.” And some narrations state, “Whoever’s mawlā I am ‘Alī is his mawlā. His intention was the friendship of Islam and the love induced thereby. This is general for all the Muslims; they should befriend one another and should not be antagonistic to each other.¹

1 *Al-ʿItiqād* p. 181. In conclusion, consider the following regarding the incident of Ghadīr:

1. The verse:

يَا أَيُّهَا الرُّسُلُ بَلِّغْ مَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْكَ مِنْ رَبِّكَ

O Messenger, announce that which has been revealed to you from your Lord,

was revealed long before the Farewell Ḥajj of Rasūl Allah ﷺ whereas the Day of Ghadīr was on the eighteenth of Dhū al-Ḥijjah upon his return from Ḥajj (see: *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/84). So the assertion that when it was revealed Rasūl Allah ﷺ delivered the sermon of Ghadīr is an obvious fabrication of person who does not know how to fabricate.

2. Regarding The narration of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* which states the following:

إنما أنا بشر يوشك أن يأتي رسول ربي فأجيب. وأنا تارك فيكم ثقلين: كتاب الله فيه الهدى والنور فخذوا بكتاب الله واستمسكوا به، فحث علي كتاب الله ورغب فيه ثم قال: وأهل بيتي أذكركم الله في أهل بيتي

I am but a human. Soon the messenger of my lord will come to whom I will respond. I am leaving the *Thaqalayn* (two weighty things) among you: the first is the Book of Allah wherein is contained guidance and light. So practice upon the Book of Allah and firmly hold on to it.” Rasūl Allah ﷺ emphasised the Book of Allah and encouraged us regarding it. He then said, “And my household! I remind you of Allah regarding my household... (*Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: Chapter regarding the virtues of the *Ṣaḥābah*: Sub-chapter regarding the virtues of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib: 3/1884).

¹After analysing their most crucial evidences from the Qur’ān and from the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, I will leave the analyses and critique of their remaining evidences to the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah which have extensively covered and extirpated the misconceptions they deceitfully raise from the books of the Sunnah.

It goes without a doubt that it is very easy to study these misconceptions and debunk them, for it is enough to have recourse to *Minhāj al-Sunnah* and books like it from the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. However, analysing all of them will require many volumes which will not prove anything new. Therefore, I have sufficed upon their strongest evidence from the Qur’ān and the Sunnah.

Another very important reason for not delving into them is that the Shī’ah do not believe anything that is established through the medium of the Ahl al-Sunnah, however authentic it might be. But they create these misconceptions for one of two reasons:

1. In order to satisfy the doubters and sceptics among their followership. That is by deceiving them into believe that these ‘beliefs’ are a locus

1 continued from page 946

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions, “This is a narration exclusive to Muslim which al-Bukhārī has not narrated. The only emphasised order therein is that of holding on to the Book of Allah, which is an order Nabī ﷺ had already previously given in the Farewell Ḥajj. He did not give an order to follow his household; he merely said, “I remind you of Allah regarding my household.” Which means that Muslims should adhere to what he had previously mentioned, long before the incident of Ghadīr, regarding the fulfilment of their rights and the prohibition of wronging them. It is thus clear that at Ghadīr there was no institution of Sharī’ah which was revealed, not regarding ‘Alī and not regarding anyone else.” (*Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4-85).

And al-Fīroz’ābādī mentions, “The statement of Rasūl Allah ﷺ ‘I remind you of Allah regarding my household’ is not exclusive to ‘Alī ﷺ, rather it is general for all of the Ahl al-Bayt, viz. the family of ‘Alī, the family of Ja’far, the family of ‘Aqīl, and the family of ‘Abbās. Strangely, the Shī’ah are the furthest away from acknowledging this, for they disregard the majority of the Ahl al-Bayt and collaborate against them with the disbelievers...” (*al-Qiḍāb al-Mushtahir* p. 13)

of consensus between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah but the Ahl al-Sunnah, out of their arrogance, do not concede them.

2. In order to keep the Ahl al-Sunnah busy with these misconceptions so that they are not spared the time to study the seminal works of the Shī'ah in ḥadīth and Qur'ānic exegesis and their transmitter dictionaries with a keen eye whereby they are able to expose the truth to the lay followers.

I therefore say that the Ahl al-Sunnah have made tremendous efforts in combatting the first aspect. But they were unable to do so with regard to the second. For the scarcity of the books of the Shī'ah made it difficult for them to critically analyse them and expose the erroneous beliefs contained within them. Yes in the belated centuries the scholars of India and Pakistan played a significant role in this regard. This issue thus still requires us to continue on this journey by uniting and synergising our efforts in presenting objective and academic studies which will expose the reality of this cult before the gullible and the vulnerable.

After analysing their strongest evidence from the Sunnah, we return to the issue of Naṣṣ analysing it as it appears in the books of the Shī'ah.

Naṣṣ in the Books of the Shī'ah:

The basis of the stance of the Shī'ah on Imāmah is Naṣṣ (explicit nomination).¹ Their evidences in support of it are variant. At times they are divine books which came down from the heavens with the explicit nomination of 'Alī عليه السلام and the subsequent Imāms; but they disappeared according to them in 260 A.H with the occultation of the 'Mahdī'.² At times they are emphatic verses of the Qur'ān which contain their unequivocal selection; but they also vanished from the Qur'ān because of the doings of the Ṣaḥābah.³ At times they are clear 'narrations' from Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم which were first contrived by Ibn Saba', as is mentioned in

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/356.

2 See p. 797 of this book.

3 See p.265 of this book.

Rijāl al-Kashshī and other books; but the Ummah unanimously decided to conceal them.¹ And at times they are esoteric interpretations of the verses of the Qur'ān which are not known to anyone besides the Imāms.²

They support these evidences with eerie claims of the Imāms having extraordinary miracles, complete infallibility, inherited books, divine inspirational knowledge, and signs in them which make them distinct from the rest of the creation, etc.

Ibn Saba' was the first person to contrive the idea of Naṣṣ. This idea was then generalised for the other members of Ahl al-Bayt, about whom the Shī'ah have differed greatly in terms of who among them were the Imāms and how many there were. And as asserted by a group of scholars, the ones who were mainly responsible for the promotion of this idea were Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam and Shayṭān al-Ṭāq. Subsequent to that, after the year 260 A.H, owing to a group of people who contrived the idea of the hidden Mahdī and claimed to be his representatives, thereby eating the money of people in his name, the idea of the twelve Imāms came into being (as will be mentioned under the topic of occultation).

Their narrations which discuss Naṣṣ have covered a large portion of their classical books like that of *al-Kāfī*, *Biḥār al-Anwār*, their books of Qur'ānic exegesis, and the books of their scholars in general, the likes of al-Mufīd, al-Ṭūsī, and Ibn Muṭahhar, etc.

So long as it remains an agreed upon fact in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah that the idea of Naṣṣ was first contrived by Ibn Saba', and that, as the books of the Shī'ah assert, it was circulated surreptitiously by the founding fathers of Shī'ism in a way that it was never disclosed before any of the scholars of Islam, including the 'Imāms' of the Ahl al-Bayt, and that the systematic development thereof ensued at the hands of people who have nothing to do with Islam, like that of Ṣaffār, al-Qummī, and al-Kulaynī; so long as these remain facts, I do not

1 See p. 885 of this book.

2 See p. 161 of this book.

think it is possible for any Muslim to believe the texts containing it, especially when they have always been on the increase across the ages.

Sometimes even some of the *Uṣūlīs* (legists) among the Shī'ah do not completely rely upon everything that features in these developmental collections. So much so that Ja'far Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā' states in his book *Kashf al-Ghiṭā'*, to which the Shī'ah have constant recourse in our times. He says:

قال المحمدون الثلاثة: كيف يوثق بتحصيل العلم عليهم

The three Muḥammads, how can they be trusted in the acquisition of knowledge.¹

Nahj al-Balāghah is the only book, every letter of which the Shī'ah undisputedly accept, notwithstanding its late compilation in the fourth century of the quotes of Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī عليه السلام—who was from the first century—and it not having any known and reliable chain of transmission to him.² If this is the status of their most reliable book then what would the condition of their other books be? Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

ليس أحد من الإمامية ينقل هذا النص بإسناد متصل فضلا عن أن يكون متواترا

There is no Shī'ī who narrates these narrations with a consistent chain of transmission, let alone it being widely narrated.³

In spite of its dubious status, if we refer to it in order to investigate the issue of Naṣṣ, we will find narrations therein which debunk it and everything else that they have claimed alongside it. The following narration thereof states that when the people expressed the desire to pledge their allegiance at the hands of Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī عليه السلام he said:

1 This quotation has passed on p. 497. He is referring to the three Muḥammads who authored their four early canonical works.

2 See p. 527

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/210.

دعوني والتمسوا غيري فإننا مستقبلون أمرا له وجوه وألوان لا تقوم له القلوب ولا تثبت عليه العقول،
وإن تركتموني فإنني كأحدكم، ولعلي أسمعكم وأطوعكم لمن وليتموه أمركم وأنا لكم وزير أخير مني
لكم أميرا

Leave me alone and look for someone else besides me. For we are to encounter in the near future such an affair which will have different angles and forms, an affair which the hearts will not be able to bear and before which intellect will not remain firm. If you leave me, I will be just an ordinary person like you. And perhaps I will be the most submissive and obedient among you to the one whom you choose. I am better off as your minister than as your ruler.¹

This narration clearly suggests that Rasūl Allah ﷺ did not explicitly nominate ‘Alī as the Imām. Or else it would not have been permissible for him to say, “Leave me,” or, “And perhaps,” and, “I am for you.”²

For how is it possible for the infallible Imām to turn down the allegiance of the people saying, “leave me,” considering the fact that it is the most important

1 In *Al-Irshād*, al-Mufīd says that the following is one of the sermons of ‘Alī عليه السلام which the scholars have preserved:

أتيتموني فقلتُم بايعنا فقلت لا أفعل فقلتُم بلي فقلت لا وقبضت يدي فبسطتموها، ونازعتمكم فجدبتموه -كذا- وتداكتم علي تذاك
الإبل الهيم علي حياضها يوم ورودها حتي ظننت أنكم قاتلي، وإن بعضكم قاتل بعض لدي فبسطت يدي فبايعتموني...

You came to me and said, “Accept our allegiance.” To which I said, “I will not.” Then you said, “Most certainly you will.” I withdrew my hand and you made me extend it. I fought with you and you pulled it—this is how the narration is recorded. And you crowded me like camels that crowded one another for water when reaching it, to the extent that I thought that you were going to kill me or one another in front of me. And so you pledged your allegiance to me... (*Al-Irshād -al-A‘lamī*, Beirut p. 130-131, *al-Ḥaydariyyah*, p. 143-144).

Will a person who is desirous of Khilāfah talk in this manner? And will he go with Fāṭimah to the houses of the Ṣaḥābah asking them to pledge allegiance to him, as the books of the Shī‘ah record? And does there remain any basis for the issue of Naṣṣ and the excommunication of those who do not concede it? Is it possible for a person to perceive that ‘Alī invited the people to disbelief (based on the Shī‘ī belief that a person who does not acknowledge the divinely appointed Imām is a disbeliever) by himself refusing to accept the allegiance of the people?

2 Maḥmūd Shukrī Ālūsī: *Ta’līqāt ‘alā Rudūd al-Shī‘ah* (manuscript).

principle of dīn? And why would he order them to pledge their allegiance to someone else saying, “Look for someone else besides me,” whereas the books of the Shī‘ah state that among the three people whom Allah will not look at on the Day of Judgment is a person who pledged his allegiance to an Imām who is not from Allah.¹

So is he ordering them to disbelieve after having īmān? Or is it that the claims of the Shī‘ah in this regard have no genuine connection with ‘Alī (عليه السلام) and are rather the forgeries of a hater or the doings of an ardent disbeliever whose primary objective is to disunite the Ummah and instigate discord amongst its ranks?

Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī states that a person who relinquishes the position of Imāmah cannot be an Imām, for if he was an Imām it would not be permissible for him to do so.² So what then would be the status of a person who rejects the allegiance of the masses and orders them to pledge allegiance to someone else? Does that not with more reason prove that there is no Naṣṣ regarding him from Rasūl Allah ﷺ?

The narration of *Nahj al-Balāghah* is thus harmonious with the historical facts and happenings which suggest that the rightly guided Khulafā’ (عليه السلام) were never desirous of assuming the station of Khilāfah and they never aspire for it. Because they treated it as a great trust and an ominous responsibility.

In addition, the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī‘ah unanimously agree that during the Khilāfah of Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Uthmān; ‘Alī did not call upon the people to pledge allegiance to him and nor did anyone do that.³ The Shī‘ah, however, motivate this with an explanation which is not behoving of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn. For they believe that he did intend to do that and that he was the one deserving of Imāmah but, owing to his inability, he did not succeed.⁴ Hence he resorted

1 See the entire text on p. (Page number missing in the Kitāb). yahaa

2 Ibn Muṭahhar: *Minhāj al-Karāmah* 1/225.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/255.

4 Ibid.

to *Taqiyyah* (dissimulation) and consequently discarded the greatest principle of dīn (as they allege). This—i.e. his disregard for Imāmah—is what inspired one of the Shīʿī sects, the Kāmiliyyah, to excommunicate him from the Muslims. This is because the one who contrived this belief did not do so out his support and partisanship for Amīr al-Muʾminīn, but in order to create disunity in the Ummah and conspire against it. Consequently, his invention resulted in the excommunication of the entire Ummah including Amīr al-Muʾminīn ʿAlī.

Anyway, further in this narration Amīr al-Muʾminīn asserts in his statement, “And perhaps I will be the most obedient and submissive among you to the one whom you give charge of your affairs,” that he will be adherent to the individual whom the Muslims choose as their Khalīfah. This obviously debunks the claim of him practicing *Taqiyyah* when pledging his allegiance to and obeying those who preceded him. Because a person who practices *Taqiyyah* cannot be like the other loyal Muslims let alone being the most obedient and submissive.

Furthermore, “To the one whom you give charge of your affairs,” establishes that the issue of appointing a ruler is left to the discretion of the Muslim populace and their consensus, not to the alleged Naṣṣ. It is likewise not restricted to a specific person.

For a second time in this narration he again repels the prospect of his leadership when he says, “I am better off as your minister than as your ruler.” This debunks the flaunting of merits and the demonstration of extraordinary miracles which the Shīʿah attribute to him. It likewise debunks his criticism of the previous Khulafāʾ which they allege he used to do in order to prove his worthiness of Imāmah.

Furthermore, in another narration he explains that he did not assume the station of Khilāfah due to aspiring for it or desiring it, but due to the Muslims pressing upon him to accept; he does not claim Naṣṣ and *Waṣiyyah* (bequest). He says:

و الله ما كانت لي في الخلافة رغبة ولا في الولاية إربة، ولكنكم دعوتموني إليها، وحملتوني عليها

I had no inclination toward the Khilāfah, nor did I have any desire to become the ruler. But you called upon me to accept it and pressed upon me to preside over it.¹

He also mentions that the establishment of his Khilāfah materialised due to the allegiance of the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār who were the people of *Shūrā* (consultation), for their consensus was reliable in this situation. If they were apostates, as the books of the Shī'ah describe them, then accordingly their consensus would hold no meaning. In the same vein, if Naṣṣ really existed he would not have required their allegiance and consensus. Amīr al-Mu'minīn mentions, as *Nahj al-Balāghah* records:

إنه بايعني القوم الذين بايعوا أبا بكر و عمر وعثمان علي ما بايعوهم عليه (فطريقة بيعته لا تختلف عما سبقه) فلم يكن للشاهد أن يختار ولا للغائب أن يرد (وهذا يوحي بأن بيعته لم تكن ثابتة من قبل كما يزعم الإمامية و إنما بعد ثبوتها بالبيعة لم يكن ثمة مجال للرد حينئذ) و إنما الشوري للمهاجرين و الأنصار، فإن اجتمعوا علي رجل و سموه إماما كان ذلك رضي (فإجماعهم هو الأصل في الاختيار لا النص)، فإن خرج عن أمرهم خارج بطعن أو بدعة ردوه إلي ما خرج منه، فإن أبي قاتلوه علي اتباعه غير سبيل المؤمنين و ولاه ما تولي

Certainly the people who pledged allegiance to Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān upon whatever they pledged allegiance to them are the very same people who have pledged allegiance to me (so he was not elected any differently from the way they were elected). Hence the present cannot nominate, and the absent cannot reject (this suggests that his Imāmah did not exist prior to this as the Shī'ah claim. It only came to being after his official election where after there remained no room for its denial.) *Shūrā* (consultation) is the prerogative of the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār; if they unite upon a person and endow him with the title 'Imām' that will be regarded as consensus (i.e. their consensus is key in the election, not Naṣṣ). If anyone, thereafter, rebels against their decision by way of criticism or innovation they will compel him to give up his rebellion. If he refuses, they will fight him for following a path other than that of the believers and they

1 *Nahj al-Balāghah* p. 322.

will give him what he has chosen (make him responsible for the choice he has made).¹

This is an unequivocal text for the non-existence of Naṣṣ. The Shūrā was for the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār; whoever they elected was the Imām and whoever thereafter rebelled had to be fought due to following a way other than that of the believers. If there was Naṣṣ regarding ‘Alī he would have definitely made mention of it.

All of these texts are from *Nahj al-Balāghah* which according to the Shī‘ah is beyond doubt and which cannot be corrupted by falsehood due to it containing the statements of the infallible Imām. The Shī‘ah do not doubt a single word thereof. These narrations debunk all their claims of Naṣṣ regarding ‘Alī and the Imāms.

This conception of leadership which is reported from ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in the *Nahj* is in harmony with what is established in the legacy of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding him. Thus making both the parties unanimous in this issue. Imām Aḥmad has narrated the following narration in his *Musnad* from Wakī — from A‘mash — from Sālim ibn Abī al-Ja‘d — from ‘Abd Allah ibn Sabu‘ who says that he heard ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ saying when it was mentioned that he will be killed:

قالوا: فاستخلف علينا قال: لا، ولكن أترككم إلي ما ترككم إليه رسول الله علي الله عليه وسلم قالوا: ما تقول لربك إذا أتيت؟ قال: أقول: اللهم تركتني فيهم ما بدا لك ثم قبضتني إليك وأنت فيهم، فإن شئت أصلحتهم، وإن شئت أفسدتهم

They said, “Appoint a ruler over us.”

He said, “No but I will leave you in the condition in which Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ left you.”

They asked, “How will you answer to Allah when you appear before him?”

1 *Nahj al-Balāghah* p. 366-367; see also *Al-Irshād (al-A‘lamī)* p. 130, (*al-Ḥaydariyyah*) p. 143.

He said, “I will say, ‘O Allah you kept me amongst them for as long you deemed appropriate. Then you gave me death whilst you were still with them. If you wanted you could have reformed them and if you wanted you could have destroyed them.’”¹

He narrates a similar narration from Aswad ibn ‘Āmir — from A‘mash — from Salamah ibn Kuhayl — from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sabu‘.² There are other similar narrations as well.³

Likewise ‘Abbās said to ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ:

فاذهب بنا إليه (يعني إلي رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم) فنسأله فيمن هذا الأمر؟ فإن كان فينا عرفناه و
إن كان في غيرنا أمرناه فوصاه بنا

Let’s go to him, i.e. Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, and ask him as to who will take charge of this affair? If he is a person from amongst us we will get to know him and if he is from another family we will tell Rasūl Allah to advise him regarding our rights.⁴

This transpired on Monday, the day Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ passed away. Which is evidence of the fact that Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ passed away without appointing anyone.⁵

It also appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* that once the people made mention of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ being the appointed successor of Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to ‘Ā’ishah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا who said:

1 Musnad Aḥmad 2/242, Aḥmad Shākir says that the chain of this narration is Ṣaḥīḥ, authentic; see also Majma‘ Al-Zawā’id 9/137, al-Haythamī therein says, “Aḥmad and Abū Ya‘lā have recorded this narration. And its narrators are the narrators of Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī. Al-Bazzār has also narrated it with a Ḥasan, good chain of transmission.

2 Al-Musnad 2/240: narration no. 1339 which Aḥmad Shākir has deemed as Ṣaḥīḥ.

3 Al-Dār Qūṭnī: al-Sunan al-Kubrā 8/149; al-Bidāyah wa Al-Nihāyah 5/250-251; 7/324-325.

4 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī: Chapter regarding Permission: 7/251.

5 Al-Bidāyah wa Al-Nihāyah 5/251.

متي أوصي إليه، وقد كنت مسندته إلي صدري، أو قالت: حجري فدعا بالطست، فلقد انخث في
خججري فما شعرت أنه قد مات فتمي أوصي إليه

When did he appoint him? I was making him recline upon my chest or (she said) my lap. He asked for a tray. Thereafter he turned in my lap and I did not realise that he passed away. So when did he appoint him?¹

Likewise it has authentically been narrated by Ibn ‘Abbās that the Rasūl ﷺ did not appoint anyone. This is recorded by Ibn Abī Shaybah — from Arqam ibn Shuraḥbīl who narrates from him.²

Deriving Evidence from the Widely Known and the Unanimously Established Aspects of Dīn

The Ahl al-Sunnah have authentically established evidences regarding the fact that Rasūl Allah ﷺ did not explicitly nominate ‘Alī رضي الله عنه as the Imām after him. And the texts which the Shī‘ah attribute to the Ahl al-Bayt are flawed either in their transmission or their purport thus rendering them baseless against the Ahl al-Sunnah.

The Shī‘ah also have their evidences which they have documented in their books. But the Ahl al-Sunnah do not concede them and aver that they have been fabricated and projected to the Imāms by some of the Shī‘ah. As for the narrations which appear in their books but debunk their claims on this issue, like that of the narrations of *Nahj al-Balāghah*, they resort to interpretations and Taqiyyah in order to discredit them.

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: Chapter of Bequests: 3/186; Chapter of Battles: 5/143; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: Chapter of the Bequest; Sub-chapter regarding not bequeathing for a person who does not deserve anything: 2/1257; *Sunan al-Nasā’ī*: Chapter of Aḥbās: Sub-chapter regarding whether Rasūl Allah ﷺ bequeathed or not: 6/240; *Musnad Aḥmad* 6/32.

2 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah* 11/207: narration no. 10988. Ibn Ḥajr has deemed it authentic (see: *Fatḥ al-Bārī* 5/361).

Hence in analysing this issue, which holds the most crucial position in the Shī'ī dogma, let us rather resort to the widely known and unanimously accepted principles of our dīn. For as Ibn Taymiyah says:

نقدر-أن الأخبار المتنازع فيها لم توجد أو لم يعلم أيها الصحيح، و نترك الاستدلال بها في الطرفين
و نرجم إلي ما هو معلوم بغير ذلك من التواتر وما يعلم من العقول والعادات وما دلت عليه النصوص
المتفق عليها

Let us for a moment assume that these contentious narrations did not exist at all, or that we are unable to ascertain which of them are correct and which not. We thus leave them aside and resort to those aspects which are widely known, which can be understood via reason and convention and which are established through the unanimously accepted texts.¹

Hereunder we will shed light upon some of these aspects which are so many that they require a separate book be dedicated to them.²

Firstly, Let us leave the contentious narrations aside and resort to the Book of Allah ﷻ by trying to understand it in light of the Arabic language alone. This is because Allah ﷻ revealed the Qur'ān in the clear Arabic language. And the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah unanimously accept the laws thereof just as they both unanimously accept the meanings that its words ought to have. Therefore it can serve as an arbitrator in this issue.

So do we find the mention of the Twelve Imāms with their names in the Qur'ān as clearly as we find the mention of Rasūl Allah ﷺ with his names and attributes? Because the Imām according to them is like a Nabī and hence the denier of an Imām is like the denier of a Nabī or even worse.

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/120.

2 Ibn Taymiyah mentions, "The people of knowledge categorically know that Rasūl Allah ﷺ did not convey anything to the Ummah with regards to the Imāmah of 'Alī. They have many ways in which they can prove this." (*Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/14).

It will suffice to make mention of the various aspects he has made mention of in different parts of his book for they are a great wealth.

And do we find any explicit mention therein of Imāmah in a like manner that we find the explicit mention of the fundamentals of Islam in various places thereof, in understanding which we do not require esoteric interpretations or fabricated narrations? For Imāmah according to them is the greatest principle of Islam.

How is it possible that they are not mentioned or even subtly implied? Is this not evidence of the fact that the claims of the Shī'ah in this regard do not have any basis? If it is, then the only way forward is to give them up because of them being in complete contrast with the book of Allah.

Ibn Taymiyyah has hinted to this approach in his exchange with Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī. Hence he says:

فإن تركوا الرواية رأساً أمكن أن تترك الرواية

If they intend to give these narrations up completely it is possible.¹

He has then applied this approach in debunking the claims of the Shī'ah regarding Imāmah by saying:

وهب أنا لا نحتج بالحديث فقد قال الله تعالى: إِنَّمَا الْمُؤْمِنُونَ الَّذِينَ إِذَا ذُكِرَ اللَّهُ وَجِلَتْ قُلُوبُهُمْ وَإِذَا تُلِيَتْ عَلَيْهِمْ آيَاتُهُ زَادَتْهُمْ إِيمَانًا وَعَلَىٰ رَبِّهِمْ يَتَوَكَّلُونَ الَّذِينَ يُقِيمُونَ الصَّلَاةَ وَمِمَّا رَزَقْنَاهُمْ يُنفِقُونَ أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ حَقًّا ۚ لَهُمْ دَرَجَاتٌ عِنْدَ رَبِّهِمْ وَمَغْفِرَةٌ وَرِزْقٌ كَرِيمٌ. فشهد لهؤلاء بالإيمان عن غير ذكر للإمامة. وقال تعالى: إِنَّمَا الْمُؤْمِنُونَ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا بِاللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ ثُمَّ لَمْ يَرْتَابُوا وَجَاهَدُوا بِأَمْوَالِهِمْ وَأَنْفُسِهِمْ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ ۖ أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الصَّادِقُونَ. فجعلهم صادقين في الإيمان من غير ذكر الإمامة.

And assume for a while that we do not derive evidence from ḥadīth. But Allah ﷻ says, ‘The believers are only those who, when Allah is mentioned, their hearts become fearful, and when His verses are recited to them, it increases them in faith; and upon their Lord they rely –. The ones who establish prayer, and from what we have provided them, they spend. Those are the believers, truly. For them are degrees [of high position]

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/32.

with their Lord and forgiveness and noble provision.”¹ So Allah ﷻ has attested to their complete faith without making mention of the doctrine of Imāmah (as part of the fundamentals). He also says, ‘The believers are only the ones who have believed in Allah and His Messenger and then doubt not but strive with their properties and their lives in the cause of Allah. It is those who are the truthful.’² Here as well Allah ﷻ talks of their sincerity of faith without the mention of Imāmah.

Ibn Taymiyyah goes on to mention other examples of this sort.³ These and other examples besides them establish the fact that the Imāmah of the Twelve Imāms, which the Shī‘ah treat as the cornerstone of their dogma and its very core, does not have any basis in the Book of Allah ﷻ.

Secondly, the grandeur of this phenomenon is such that it should have been widely transmitted; if it had any basis it would have been transmitted as efficiently as the other teachings of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. Especially when considering the fact that many fabricated and baseless narrations have been reported regarding the merits of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. So why was the truth not transmitted whereas it was meant for the people? For Rasūl Allah ﷺ had ordered the people to convey whatever they heard from him. Owing to which it was impermissible for them to conceal that which Allah ﷻ ordered them to convey.⁴ Similarly, if the Ṣaḥābah concealed the explicit appointment of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه they would have concealed his merits as well and not reported anything thereof. However that is in contradiction with the reality. Hence it is evident that if there was anything of that sort it would have been reported.

This is also because the explicit appointment of a Khalīfah is a very great event. And great events usually necessitate large-scale popularity. So if such popularity

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 2, 3, 4.

2 Sūrah al-Hujurāt: 15.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/14.

4 Ibid. 4/14.

did indeed materialise, his opponents and proponents would have known it alike. But the mere fact that it did not reach any of the jurists and scholars of ḥadīth suggests that it is a lie.¹ The only people that have reported it are the Shī'ah, who are the claimants (and thus have to provide sound evidence) and whose narrations yield a lot of suspicion due to their lies, transgressions, innovations, treading the path of deviance by claiming impossible things which defy reason, and due to them reviling the Companions of Rasūl Allah ﷺ.²

Furthermore, the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ conveyed every aspect of the life of Rasūl Allah ﷺ to us, whether it be his statements and actions, his orders and prohibitions, his eating and drinking, his sitting and sleeping, or anything else related to his life. It is thus unreasonable to postulate that they did not convey his explicit nomination of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Ibn Ḥazm says:

وبرهان ضروري وهو أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم مات وجمهور الصحابة رضي الله عنهم حاشا من كان في النواحي يعلم الناس الدين فما منهم أحد أشار إلي علي بكلمة يذكر فيها أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم نص عليه. ومن المحال الممتنع الذي لا يمكن ألبتة اتفاق أكثر من عشرين ألف إنسان متنازلي الهمم والنيات والأنساب... علي طي عهد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إليهم. وما وجدنا قط رواية عن أحد في النص المدعي إلا رواية واهية عن مجهولين إلي مجهول يكني أبا الحمراء لا يعرف من هو في الخلق.

The most conclusive evidence in this regard is that Rasūl Allah ﷺ passed away and the majority of the Ṣaḥābah, apart from those who were teaching people dīn in the outskirts of Madīnah, were present. Not one of them even hinted toward Rasūl Allah ﷺ emphatically appointing 'Alī. It is impossible to conceive that a followership comprising of more than twenty thousand people despite their disparate endeavours, ambitions, and ethnicities succeeded in doing away with a bequest of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. And apart from one narration which is narrated through the transmission

1 Al-Rāzī: *Uṣūl al-Dīn* p. 137.

2 Al-Āmidī: *Ghāyat al-Marām* p. 377.

of unknown people who narrate from an unknown person by the name of Abū al-Ḥamrā', I do not know of any narration which talks of the alleged explicit nomination.¹

Thirdly, Imāmah is one of the mandatory aspects which concern the wellbeing of the populace. So to say that Rasūl Allah ﷺ emphatically nominated 'Alī رضي الله عنه but the Ṣaḥābah distorted his nomination, would open the door for any heretic to claim, for example, that ṣalāh initially comprised of ten prayers but owing to their base desires the Ṣaḥābah concealed five and kept five. If someone succeeds in this manner in distorting the emphatic orders of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, then to distort any mandatory aspect of dīn will become possible too. Consequently, this will reach a stage wherein no aspect of dīn will remain reliable.²

Fourthly, the claim of the Shī'ah regarding the explicit nomination of 'Alī رضي الله عنه is akin to the claim regarding the explicit nomination of 'Abbās رضي الله عنه. If they aver that the explicit nomination of 'Abbās رضي الله عنه is invalid it can similarly be said that the explicit nomination of 'Alī رضي الله عنه is also invalid. For by refuting the appointment of 'Abbās the appointment of 'Alī automatically loses credibility due to there being no valid and explicit appointment in both cases. Therefore we find that there are many sub-sects among the Shī'ah who differ greatly with the Twelvers regarding the explicit nomination of many of those who they take as their Imāms. To the extent that regarding the Twelfth Imām there are twenty variant subsects. Each one refutes the "Naṣṣ" of the other.

Furthermore, Naṣṣ is derived from the word *Minaṣṣah* which means: a person who is mounted on a horse and is conspicuous. So where is the conspicuousness of the Naṣṣ regarding 'Alī رضي الله عنه? If it had any basis it would have been perceptible, famous, reported widely and on the tongues of the people; the elite and the commonality would have known it alike. If they say that there was Naṣṣ but the people concealed it, it can also be said that there was Naṣṣ regarding 'Abbās but the

1 *Al-Faṣl* 4/161.

2 *Daf Shubah al-Khawārij wa al-Rawāfiḍ* p. 15.

people concealed it as well. If an issue of this magnitude can be done away with, then someone can also claim that Rasūl Allah ﷺ had a son whom he had explicitly appointed but the Ṣaḥābah were jealous of him and consequently killed him. There is a great amount of similarity in these claims which no intelligent person will ever make.¹

Fifthly, we all know that no two people disputed Abū Bakr's nomination of 'Umar, nor did any confusion ensue in that regard. When 'Umar similarly appointed the consultative committee consisting of six people it became so widely known that no one could deny it. Rasūl Allah ﷺ was the most virtuous; the readiness of the people to adhere to his orders was by far more than their readiness to adhere to anyone else; and their desire to transmit his orders and teachings was far greater. Based on this it is impossible to believe that no dispute ensued regarding Abū Bakr's nomination and likewise 'Umar's, instead even Mu'āwiyah's nomination of his son Yazīd gained a lot of popularity and was widely known to an extent that it was undisputed, but Rasūl Allah's ﷺ nomination was not reported by one person,² as the Shī'ah acknowledge that Imāmah and the narrations regarding it were a secret from among their secrets.

Sixthly, it is not possible to conceive that the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār unanimously accepted 'Umar as the undisputed successor of Abū Bakr but they did not accept 'Alī as the appointed successor of Rasūl Allah ﷺ? For were the Muslims more obedient to Abū Bakr than they were to Rasūl Allah ﷺ?

How can an intelligent person concede and how can it occur to any person pious or impious (except those of course whom Allah has intended to misguide) that the Muhājirīn, the Anṣār and those who meticulously succeeded them despite knowing that Rasūl Allah ﷺ nominated 'Alī رضي الله عنه as his successor and ordered them to befriend him disobeyed him (Rasūl Allah) and discarded his bequest. But when Abū Bakr ordered them to make 'Umar their ruler they

1 Ibid. p. 14.

2 Ibid. p. 14-15 (manuscript).

obeyed. Likewise when ‘Umar ordered them to appoint a consultative committee consisting of six people they obeyed without hesitation.¹

Furthermore, it is impossible to think that the Muslims established ṣalāh, zakāh, fasting, Ḥajj, striving in the path of Allah, and all the other injunctions of Islam but neglected the greatest of them all, i.e. allegiance to ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ which is enough to render all their deeds unaccepted. And what benefit was there for them in pledging their allegiance to Abū Bakr and not to ‘Alī?²

Lastly, if the Naṣṣ regarding ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ existed and was valid it would not have been permissible for him to become part of the consultative committee appointed by ‘Umar.³ Thus he should have said, “I am the appointed ruler and therefore there is no need for me to be part of the committee.” Nor would it have been permissible for him to give his allegiance to Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.

It is not reasonable to think that he, being a lion in his bravery, withheld the information of Naṣṣ due to the fear of death. For he was willing to sacrifice his life several times during the lifetime of Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in order to defend Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and during his reign in the Battles of Jamal and Ṣiffin. So why would he become a victim of cowardice between these two periods⁴ owing to which he had to resort to Taqiyyah?

Furthermore, if he was the appointed ruler and he was given charge of the Ummah’s affairs after Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, he was entrusted with a responsibility which he should have diligently carried out, and in securing which he should have

1 Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Ḥātim ibn Zanjūyah: *Imāmah Abī Bakr al-Ṣiddīq* (manuscript).

2 Ibid.

3 *Daf’ Shubuh al-Khawārij wa al-Rāfiḍah* p. 15. Imām al-Bukhārī has cited the narration about the incident of the election of ‘Uthmān and the people’s unanimous approval thereof (*Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: Chapter regarding the Virtues of the Ṣaḥābah: Sub-chapter regarding the story of allegiance and the unanimous election of ‘Uthmān... 4/204, onwards).

4 *Al-Faṣl* 4/162.

repressed all opposition. If he had failed in doing so without a valid reason then he had violated the rights thereof (which is very unlikely given his position and repute). And if he was helpless owing to which he could not take any action, then some sort of incapacitating occurrence should have been recorded which would hint at his endeavour to procure his right and subsequent inability, especially when he was the man in charge. Consider, ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه—who according to you was weaker than ‘Alī رضي الله عنه—did not give this task up and was rather happy with the decree of Allah and His order; he did not neglect the responsibility entrusted to him. Likewise, when in his time the people turned apostate and refused to pay zakāh, Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه did not leave the problem unattended. Had he done so Islam would have vanished. But he fought them and Allah سبحانه وتعالى aided him against them. There was no one among the Ṣaḥābah similarly who remained silent when it came to establishing the truth.¹

So how can the Shī‘ah possibly ascribe acquiescence with falsehood, cowardice, and fear to Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه due to which he failed to demand his legitimate right? So much so that all the people besides a few turned apostate due to him postponing the demand of his right, notwithstanding that he was the Lion of Allah and His Rasūl.

In fact it is not recorded anywhere that he invited the people to himself or that he even defended his leadership, not to mention anything about fighting to secure it. For had any of that happened it would have been famous. Despite the occurrence of some very crucial occasions whose very nature demanded that he disclose his appointment, like that of the incidents of Saqīfah and the Shūrā, he did not make any mention of Naṣṣ.² He rather called upon his partisans to pledge

1 *Daf Shubah al-Khawārij wa al-Rāfiḍah* p. 16.

2 Their scholar al-Bayāḍī says that he did not make mention of the Naṣṣ for one of two reasons: The people would have denied if he were to mention it which would render them out of the fold of Islam due to denying a widely accepted principle of dīn. By resorting to a consultative process they intended to choose the best; so he marshalled such evidence against them so as to prove his own superiority (*al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm* 1/299).

their allegiance to him, as the Shī'ah acknowledge, but he did not claim Naṣṣ, his explicit nomination.¹

Ibn Taymiyyah has mentioned that one of the evidences wherefrom we can definitively conclude that Rasūl Allah ﷺ did not convey anything to the Ummah regarding the explicit nomination of 'Alī رضي الله عنه is that after his demise one of the Anṣār proposed the idea that two rulers should be elected, one from the Anṣār and one from the Muhājirīn.² But the Ṣaḥābah rejected and asserted that leadership is only for the Quraysh;³ they are reported to have narrated many reports from Rasūl Allah ﷺ which state that rulership is for the Quraysh.

continued from page 965

Consider his answer, you will find that it is baseless. For he claims that 'Alī رضي الله عنه did not reveal the Naṣṣ due to the possibility of it being denied which would make the denier an apostate. But they excommunicate the Ṣaḥābah due to their denial of Naṣṣ. It is baseless also because it implies that people should not be invited to core aspects of dīn because of the possibility of them being denied and the consequent apostasy of their deniers.

As for his reasoning for 'Alī رضي الله عنه not mentioning the Naṣṣ in the incident of Shūrā, his acknowledgement that 'Alī رضي الله عنه did not reveal the Naṣṣ is sufficient to support our case. Because his assertion that 'Alī رضي الله عنه did not see the need to mention it there is inharmonious with reason and rationality. Especially when the context is that of Imāmah and leadership which according to them is one of the fundamentals of dīn.

1 Al-Bayāḍī says, "If they say: 'The fact that 'Alī asked his partisans to pledge allegiance to him is evidence that there was no Naṣṣ regarding him,' our response will be: 'Khilāfah was his right so he could pursue it however he wanted.' (*al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm* 1/299). This proves that when 'Alī رضي الله عنه assumed the position of Khilāfah after 'Uthmān he did not prove his right to it by way of Naṣṣ. Had there been any Naṣṣ he would have revealed it and he would not have required the process of allegiance and election. As to his statement, "So he could pursue it however he wanted," it does not hold any value. Because Khilāfah according to them is not just the right of the Ahl al-Bayt, because the belief and disbelief of the people is attached to it; it is a station equal to prophethood or even greater. But, as is the nature of the Shī'ah, they always make claims which openly contradict and violate each other.

2 This is conceded by the Shī'ah as well (see: *al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm* 1/299).

3 *Musnad Aḥmad* 3/129, 4/421; *Musnad Abī Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī* p. 125: narration no. 926 and 2133. Imām Muslim has narrated this narrations with the words, "People are the subjects of Quraysh." Another wording of the reads as follows, "This matter will remain for the Quraysh even if there are only two people." (*Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter regarding leadership: 2/1451-1452).

Despite all of this, not one person in that gathering reported anything that suggested that ‘Alī عليه السلام was more rightful of it and hence the people pledged their allegiance to Abū Bakr عليه السلام. Notwithstanding that most of the Banū ‘Abd Manāf, comprising of the Banū Hāshim and the Banū Umayyah, had a very strong inclination toward the leadership of ‘Alī عليه السلام but none of them made any mention of his explicit nomination by Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم. The exact same ensued during the reign of ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān عليه السلام. Similarly when he took charge of affairs in his era he did not make mention of Naṣṣ, nor did anyone from his household or from the popular Ṣaḥābah make any such claim.

Furthermore, if Naṣṣ existed there would have been no disputes during his rule. But the reality is that the Ummah did not unanimously accept him, nor did they accept anyone else besides him.

Even when the incident of arbitration took place and most of the people were in his favour there was no one among his partisans, let alone anyone else besides them, who made any reference to his explicit nomination despite the context demanding that. They rather presented the narration regarding the rebellious party killing ‘Ammār عليه السلام as their evidence.¹ This narration is at most narrated by three people or so; it is not a widespread narration. But Naṣṣ according to the Shī‘ah is widespread. Subḥān Allah, eerie indeed, how did the partisans of ‘Alī عليه السلام deem it appropriate to support their stance with this ḥadīth (which is not narrated by more than three people) but not with Naṣṣ (which is allegedly widespread)?²

As for the claim regarding the Naṣṣ or explicit nomination of the Twelve Imāms, its improbability is much more, its falsity more evident, and its deception more

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: Chapter regarding Jihad: Sub-chapter regarding wiping dust of people: 3/207; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: Chapter regarding Fitān, trails: 3/2235; *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*: Chapter regarding Merits; Sub-chapter regarding the Merits of ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir: 5/669; *Musnad Aḥmad* 2/161, 164, 206; 3/5, 22, 28, 90; 4/97; 5/214, 306; 6/289, 300, 311, 315.

2 *Minḥāj al-Sunnah* 4/14-15.

obvious. For the Twelvers are the only ones who reported it whereas they are one sect of the Shī'ah, who comprise of seventy different sects, who all deny their claims in this regard.

And the *Nuṣūṣ* (texts) which contain explicit nomination, which the Twelvers cite in support of their stance are all opposed by the texts of the other multitudes of Shī'ah sects which they present in support of those besides the Twelve whom they take as their Imāms.

These claims did not come into existence but two hundred and fifty years after the demise of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. For they were contrived by the later Shī'ah; the ones who preceded them did not aver the same.

The Ahl al-Sunnah and their scholars, who are ten times more than the Shī'ah, know without a shadow of doubt that they are all lies which have been attributed to Rasūl Allah ﷺ and are willing to enter into *Mubāhalah* (mutual imprecation) with the Shī'ah regarding that.

Likewise, the legacy of the Ahl al-Bayt which has been widely reported and documented attest to the fact that they are lies and that the Ahl al-Bayt did not claim Naṣṣ for themselves. Rather they refuted and belied any person who claimed it, let alone affirming the Naṣṣ regarding the Twelve Imāms.¹

If the issue of Imāmah was really as the Shī'ah describe it to be it would not have been permissible for Ḥasan رضي الله عنه to relinquish his Imāmah to Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه and thereby aid him in deviance, invalidating the truth, and demolishing the dīn owing to which he would be considered his partner in every evil. Likewise it would not have been permissible for him to disregard the bequest of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. Nor would it have been permissible for his brother, Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه, to agree with him to the extent that he did not violate his allegiance to Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه till he passed away. To reiterate, why did Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما consider

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/209-210.

it lawful to disregard the bequest of Rasūl Allah ﷺ willingly without any coercion, especially when there were more than a hundred thousand souls with Ḥasan رضي الله عنه who were willing to give their lives for him. By Allah, if Ḥasan رضي الله عنه did not know that he had the option of handing his Imāmah over to Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and equally the option of not handing it over to him he would not have combined the two by securing it for himself for six months because of it being his right and subsequently relinquishing it to Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه without any genuine need to do so. Instead it was best for him. Because his grandfather Rasūl Allah ﷺ had prophesised that upon the pulpit when he said:

إن ابني هذا سيد ولعل الله أن يصلح به بين فئتين عظيمتين من المسلمين

Verily this son of mine is a leader. And perhaps Allah will unite two big great groups of the Muslims through him.

This is the wording of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*.¹

Nonetheless, there are many sound and definitive arguments in this regard. Some are enough for the guidance of a person who strips himself from following his ego and fanaticism.

The Ruling regarding a Person who denies the Imāmah of One of the Twelve Imāms

According to the Shī‘ah Imāmah is equivalent to *Nubuwwah* (prophethood) or even greater. And it is the most crucial principle of dīn.

1 *Al-Faṣl* 4/172-173. *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: Chapter regarding Reconciliation: Sub-chapter regarding Rasūl Allah ﷺ saying to Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, “This son of mine is a leader. And perhaps Allah will unite two great group of Muslim through him.” 3/169; *Sunan Abū Dāwūd*: Chapter regarding Sunnah; Sub-chapter regarding avoiding Fitnah: 5/48; *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*: Chapter regarding merits: Subchapter regarding the Merits of Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه: 5/658; *Sunan al-Nasā’ī*: Chapter of Jumu‘ah: Sub-chapter regarding the Imām addressing the congregation whilst on the pulpit: 3/107; *Musnad Aḥmad* 5/37-38, 44, 49, 51.

The ruling of the Shī'ah regarding a person who denies the Imāmah of one of the twelve Imāms further asserts this extremism. For they excommunicate such a person and aver that he is deserving of everlasting punishment in the fire of Jahannam.

Ibn Bābawayh says:

واعتقادنا فيمن جحد إمامة أمير المؤمنين والأئمة من بعده أنه بمنزلة من جحد النبوة الأنبياء. واعتقادنا فيمن أقر بأمر المؤمنين وأنكر واحدا من بعده من الأئمة أنه بمنزلة من آمن بجميع الأنبياء ثم أنكر نبوة الأنبياء

It is our belief that a person who denies the Imāmah of Amīr al-Mu'minīn and the subsequent Imāms is like a person who denies the prophethood of the Ambiyā'. We likewise assert that a person who believes in the Imāmah of Amīr al-Mu'minīn, but denies the Imāmah of any of the subsequent Imāms is like a person who believes in all the Ambiyā' and then denies the prophethood of Rasūl Allah ﷺ.¹

This text suggests that the Shī'ah excommunicate all the denominations of the Muslims, including the variant sects of the Shī'ah which existed throughout history, notwithstanding the fact that they have received their legacy from them. Because many of their narrators are members of those sects.

Their scholar al-Ṭūsī mentions:

و دفع الإمامة كفر، كما أن دفع النبوة كفر، لأن الجهل بهما علي حد واحد

The denial of Imāmah is disbelief just as the denial of Nubuwwah is disbelief, because ignorance regarding them is of the same level.²

This verdict apparently, was not sufficient to satisfy Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī who asserted that the denial of Imāmah is even graver than the denial of Nubuwwah. He thus says:

1 *Al-I'tiqādāt* p.111; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/62.

2 *Al-Ṭūsī: Talkhīṣ al-Shāfi* 4/131; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 8/368.

الإمامة لطف عام، والنبوة لطف خاص لإمكان خلو الزمان من نبي حي بخلاف الإمام، وإنكار اللطف العام شر من إنكار اللطف خاص

Imāmah is a general mercy and Nubuwwah is a special mercy. This is because of the possibility of an era being empty of a Nabī but not of an Imām. And the denial of the general mercy is graver than the denial of the special mercy.¹

So he has deemed a person who does not believe in their Imāms to be worse than the Jews and the Christians, based on the fact that no era will ever be empty of an Imām. This is an indication to their belief regarding the existence of the awaited ‘Hidden Imām’ whose existence many Shī‘ī sects have denied and regarding who the genealogists and the historians assert that he was never born. But this scholar of the Shī‘ah asserts that his denial is the worst form of disbelief.

Their scholar al-Mufīd has written that the excommunication of the Muslim Ummah is their unanimous stance. He says:

اتفقت الإمامية علي أن من أنكر إمامة أحد من الأئمة وجحد ما أوجبه الله تعالى له من فرض الطاعة فهو كافر ضال مستحق للخلود في النار

The Imāmiyyah unanimously agree that a person who denies the Imāmah of one of the Imāms and denies the obedience that Allah ﷻ has ordained for them is a deviant *Kāfir* (disbeliever) who deserves everlasting punishment in the fire of Jahannam.²

This reached a stage where their scholar Ni‘mat Allah al-Jazā‘irī openly announced the detraction of the Shī‘ah from the Muslim Ummah due to the doctrine of Imāmah. He says:

لم نجتمع معهم علي إله ولا نبي ولا علي إمام، وذلك أنهم يقولون إن ربه هو الذي كان محمد صلي الله عليه وسلم نبيه، و خليفته بعده أبو بكر ونحن لا نقول بهذا الرب ولا بذلك النبي، بل نقول: إن الرب الذي خليفة نبيه أبو بكر ليس ربنا ولا ذلك النبي نبينا

1 Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī: *al-Alfayn* p. 3

2 Al-Mufīd: *al-Masā’il*. Al-Majlisī also cites this verdict of his in *Biḥār al-Anwār* 8/366.

We do not concur with them on the same deity, the same Nabī, and the same Imām. This is because they believe that their Lord is the one whose Nabī was Muḥammad ﷺ, who was succeeded by Abū Bakr, whereas we do not believe in such a Lord and such a Nabī; instead we say, “The deity whose Nabī was succeeded by Abū Bakr is not our deity and that Nabī is not our Nabī.”¹

After this blanket excommunication of all the Muslims they have specifically issued rulings of apostasy regarding all the categories of the Muslims besides the Twelvers; hence their excommunication includes the following categories:

1. The Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. Foremost in the list are the most virtuous individuals of this Ummah after its Nabī, Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما.
2. The vast majority of the Ahl al-Bayt.
3. The Muslim rulers and their respective rules.
4. The Muslim metropolises and their inhabitants.
5. The Muslim judges.
6. The scholars of the Muslims and their Imāms (in terms of the various schools of thought).
7. The Muslim denominations.
8. The Ummah at large.

In the coming pages I shall discuss their assertions regarding all these categories.

The Ṣaḥābah

The books of the Shī‘ah are replete with curses and rulings of apostasy regarding those whom Allah سبحانه وتعالى was pleased with and who were pleased with him, i.e.

¹ *Al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah* 2/279.

the Muhājirīn, the Anṣār, the veterans of Badr, the people of the pledge of Riḍwān, and all the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. Besides a few Ṣaḥābah who do not amount to even the of fingers on the hand, they have not spared anybody.

After the disclosure of their books this issue no more remained one which could be hidden by way of Taqiyyah, even though previously it might have been unclear to many of the scholars of Islam. Therefore, we find that in his commentary of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* al-Nawawī mentions that the Imāmiyyah maintain that the Ṣaḥābah erred in giving precedence to others over ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ but they do not dub them disbelievers.¹

However, from among the scholars and the heresiographers there were some who were aware of the issue; al-Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār states:

و أما الإمامية فقد ذهبوا إلى أن الطريق إلى إمامة اثني عشر النص الجلي، الذي يكفر ممن أنكره، و يجب تكفيره، فكفروا لذلك صحابة النبي عليه السلام

As for the Imāmiyyah, they assert that the Twelve Imāms assumed the position of Imāmah through *Naṣṣ Jalī* (explicit nomination) the denial of which is dubbed an apostate whose excommunication is obligatory. It is on this basis that they have excommunicated the Ṣaḥābah of Nabī ﷺ.²

‘Abd al-Qāḥir al-Baghdādī,³ Ibn Taymiyyah⁴ and others⁵ have remarked along the same lines.

But I have not found a scholar from among them who has mentioned the correct amount of Ṣaḥābah which the Shī‘ah exclude from their blanket excommunication which is in harmony with that which appears in their books. Hence ‘Abd al-Qāḍir al-Baghdādī says:

1 Al-Nawawī: *Sharḥ Muslim* 15/174.

2 *Sharḥ al-Uṣūl al-Kaḥmsah* p. 761.

3 *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* p. 321.

4 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/128.

5 Al-Bazdawī: *Uṣūl al-Dīn* p. 247-248.

و أما الإمامية فقد زعم أكثرهم أن الصحابة ارتدت بعد النبي صلي الله عليه وسلم سوي علي وابنيه و مقدار ثلاثة عشر منهم

As for the Imāmiyyah, most of them¹ believe that all the Ṣaḥābah turned apostate after the demise of Rasūl Allah ﷺ with the exception of ‘Alī, his two sons, and thirteen other individuals.

And Ibn Taymiyyah says:

إن الرافضة تقول: إن المهاجرين والأنصار كتموا النص، فكفروا إلا نفرا قليلا.. إما بضعة عشر أو أكثر ثم يقولون إن أبابكر وعمر ونحوهما ما زالوا منافقين. وقد يقولون بل آمنوا ثم كفروا

The Shī‘ah say that the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār concealed the Naṣṣ. They have, therefore, excommunicated all of them besides a few, roughly thirteen or more. They then at times claim that Abū Bakr ‘Umar and their likes were always hypocrites. And at times they say that they brought faith but subsequently disbelieved.²

You will see that the number they exclude is far less than what these scholars have mentioned.

This is what appears in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the others about the stance of the Shī‘ah regarding the Ṣaḥābah. Henceforth you will see their actual stance in light of what appears in their seminal works.

The books of the Twelvers state that, besides three people, all the Ṣaḥābah turned apostate due to nominating Abū Bakr as their ruler. Some narrations make an addition of another three or four people who later conceded the rulership of ‘Alī. Which makes the sum total seven. They do not go beyond that.

1 Note that ‘Abd al-Qāhir does generalise this stance for all the Imāmiyyah; al-Ash‘arī thus alludes to the fact that there are two sects among them in this regard (see: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/128-129).

2 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 3/356.

The Shī'ah have documented this fallacy in the most authentic of their books. They have documented it in their first book which came to the fore, i.e. the book of *Sulaym ibn Qays*.¹ Subsequently, the books that followed consistently affirmed it and promoted it. Foremost among them is *al-Kāfi*,² which is considered the most authentic of the four early canonical works, *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, their primary work in transmitter biographies, and their other works; *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī*,³ *al-Burhān*,⁴ *al-Ṣāfi*,⁵ *Tafsīr Nūr al-Thaḳalayn*,⁶ *al-Ikhtiṣāṣ*,⁷ *al-Sarā'ir*,⁸ and *Biḥār al-Anwār*.⁹

The contents of these books are not just views which some of their scholars held, rather they are narrations which are reported from their infallible Imāms who carry the merit of 'sacredness' and 'infallibility'.

As for reviling the Ṣaḥābah, that unique generation which is lauded in the Qur'ān, their scholars have blackened the pages of their books with it.

If I were to present to the reader everything I read in this regard it would require many volumes. Hence I will suffice on citing those narrations which clearly excommunicate the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, for they will expose the nature of the remaining revilements and criticisms.

Al-Kulaynī narrates in *al-Kāfi*:

عن حمran بن أعين قال: قلت لأبي جعفر عليه السلام: جعلت فداك ما أقلنا لو اجتمعنا علي شاة ما أفنينها؟ فقال: ألا أحدثك بأعجب من ذلك، المهاجرين والأنصار ذهبوا إلّا - وأشار بيده - ثلاثة

1 Book of *Sulaym ibn Qays* p. 74-75.

2 Al-Kulaynī: *al-Kāfi* 2/244.

3 *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī* 1/199.

4 Hāshim al-Baḥrānī: *al-Burhān* 1/319.

5 Muḥsin al-Kāshānī: *al-Ṣāfi* 1/389.

6 Al-Ḥuwayzīnī: *Nūr al-Thaḳalayn* 1/396.

7 Al-Mufīd: *al-Ikhtiṣāṣ* p. 4-5.

8 Ibn Idrīs: *al-Sarā'ir* p. 468

9 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/245, 351, 352, 440.

Ḥamrān ibn A‘yan reports, “I asked Abū Ja‘far عليه السلام thus, ‘May I be sacrificed for thee! How few are we in number; if we all gather to eat a lamb we will not be able to finish it.’”

He said, “Should I not tell you of something even more baffling: the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār all turned apostate besides (and he indicated with his hand) three.”^{1,2}

This narration as it stands, includes the most virtuous of the companions of Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم, i.e. the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār. It also mentions that in the era of Abū Ja‘far the Shī‘ah, in comparison to the broader Muslim community, were so few in number that if they were to gather to eat a lamb they would not be able to finish it, of which they complained to their Imām. And in order to console them, the Imām told them that even the Shī‘ah of the bygone era did not exceed more than three individuals because the rest of the people back then had turned apostate.

The purport of this narration also tells us of the Shī‘ah being a few in number in the era of Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad al-Bāqir, of their movement not gaining much momentum and popularity, their survival in the dungeons of Taqiyyah and concealment, and that they would comfort their followers by forging and ascribing narrations of its kind to the Ahl al-Bayt.

This narration does not disclose the names of the three Ṣaḥābah who were allegedly free from ‘apostasy’ due to them concurring with the stance of the Shī‘ah. In another narration, however, there names are explicitly mentioned:

1 One of their contemporaries, ‘Alī Akbar al-Ghafārī commenting upon this narration states, “Meaning that he indicated with three fingers of his hand. He meant Salmān, Abū Dhar and Miqdād. (*al-Kāfī* 2-244: footnotes). As you can see this fallacious belief did not leave the minds of their scholars till these times. More details will appear in the Chapter regarding the contemporary Shī‘ah.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*: Chapter regarding belief and disbelief: Sub-chapter regarding the meagre number of the believers: 2/244; *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 7; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/345.

عن حنان بن سدير عن أبيه عن أبي جعفر عليه السلام قال: كان الناس أهل ردة بعد النبي صلي الله عليه وسلم إلا ثلاثة. فقلت: ومن الثلاثة؟ قال: المقداد بن الأسود، وأبو ذر الغفاري، وسلمان الفارسي، ثم عرف الناس بعد يسير، وقال: هؤلاء الذين دارت عليهم الرحا وأبوا أن يبايعوا لأبي بكر حتي جاؤا بأمر المؤمنين مكرها فبايع

Ḥannān ibn Sadīr narrates from his father who narrates from Abū Jaʿfar that he said, “The people renounced Islām after the demise of Rasūl Allah ﷺ besides three people.”

I asked, “Who are these three people?”

He said, “Miqdād ibn Aswad, Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī, and Salmān al-Fārisī. And then after a while the people realised.”

He further said, “Upon these people does the mill spin; they were the ones who refused to pledge their allegiance to Abū Bakr until Amīr al-Muʾminīn was brought and forced to pledge his allegiance.”¹

Furthermore, with the exception of one, the other two were not safe from doubt concerning the Imām, which according to them is the basis of Īmān. Hence when Abū Jaʿfar said that all the people turned apostate besides three, he followed it by saying:

إن أردت الذي لم يشك، ولم يدخله شيء فالمقداد، فأما سلمان فإنه عرض في قلبه عارض أن عند أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام اسم الله الأعظم لو تكلم به لأخذتهم الأرض، وهو هكذا، فلبب ووجت عنقه حتي تركت كالسلسلة، فمر به أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام فقال له: يا أبا عبد الله هذا من ذاك، بايع، وأما أبو ذر فأمر أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام بالسكوت، ولم يأخذه في الله لومة لائم، فأبي إلا أن يتكلم فمر به عثمان فأمر به

If you want to know the one who did not doubt and who had no suspicion, it was Miqdād. As for Salmān it occurred to him that why is Amīr al-Muʾminīn acting in this manner when he knows the *Isṁ Aʿẓam* (greatest name) of Allah ﷻ which if he was to utter the earth would grip its

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 6; *al-Kāfi* (with the commentary of al-Māzindarānī): Chapter regarding the Orchard: 12/321-322

people. Hence he was pulled by his collar¹ and his neck was beaten² till looked as it he had been burnt.

Amīr al-Mu'minīn passed by him and said, "O Abū 'Abd Allah! This is because of that. Pledge (allegiance)."

Subsequently, he pledged.

And as for Abū Dhar, he ordered Amīr al-Mu'minīn to keep quiet and did not fear the criticism of anyone regarding the commands of Allah. However, Amīr al-Mu'minīn refused but to speak. So when 'Uthmān passed Abū Dhar gave him an order regarding him...³

Furthermore, these three individuals who were safe from apostasy were not safe from the criticisms of the Shī'ah. Hence their narrations mention that the relationship between them was outwardly a pleasant one. But if each one of them were to know what was in the heart of the other he would have killed him or at least made a supplication of mercy for the one who killed him. This is because each one of them was a stranger to the other in terms of his beliefs and ideas. The following narration appears in *Rijāl al-Kashshī*:

قال أمير المؤمنين: يا أبا ذر إن سلمان لو حدثك بما أعلم لقلت رحم الله قاتل سلمان

Amīr al-Mu'minīn says, "O Abū Dhar if Salmān were to tell you what he knows you will say, 'May Allah have mercy on the killer of Salmān.'"⁴

Abū Baṣīr narrates:

و عن أبي بصير قال: سمعت أبا عبد الله رضي الله عنه يقول: قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يا سلمان لو عرض علمك علي مقداد لكفر، يا مقداد لو عرض علمك علي سلمان لكفر

1 Talbīb means to gather the clothes by the neck and then pull them (*Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 11).

2 Waja'a in the Arabic language means to strike with the hand or the knife (Ibid.)

3 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 11; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/440.

4 Ibid. p. 15.

I heard Abū ‘Abd Allah saying, “Rasūl Allah ﷺ said, “O Salmān if your knowledge is presented to Miqdād he will kill you. And O Miqdād if your knowledge is presented to Salmān he will consider you an apostate.”¹

This suggests that the communication which existed between these three, whom the Shī‘ah consider to be the pure Shī‘ah, was based on Taqiyyah and concealment. To further prove this, Abū Ja‘far narrates from his father that he said:

ذكرت التقيّة يوما عند علي عليه السلام فقال: إن علم أبو ذر ما في قلب سلمان لقتله، و قد آخي رسول الله بينهما فما ظنك بسائر الخلق

One day I made mention of Taqiyyah to Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Alī and he said, “If Abū Dhar learns of what is in the heart of Salmān he will kill him. The brotherhood that Rasūl Allah ﷺ had established between them notwithstanding. So what do you think would be the case of the rest of the creation?”²

These narrations portray the characteristics of the people of innovation and disbelief, for you will consider them to be united but their hearts will be disunited; the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم were free from these traits.

But from these texts we gather that the Shī‘ah excommunicate the Companions of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. We, likewise, learn of the true image of the Shī‘ah, one which is not easily known of them, in terms of their numbers, the disunity of their hearts, the malicious intentions they harboured against each other, and their belief that no one is upon īmān besides them. These were distinctive characteristics of their first generation, so you can well imagine what would be the condition of those who followed.

Nonetheless, the narrations of the Shī‘ah assert that these three individuals were later joined by another four, which makes the total number of believers

1 Ibid. p. 11.

2 Ibid. p. 17.

(or Shī'ah) in the era of the Ṣaḥābah seven. They have not exceeded this number. This is what their narrations mention:

عن حارث بن المغيرة السري، قال: سمعت عبد الملك بن أعين يسأل أبا عبد الله رضي الله عنه فلم يزل يسأله حتي قال له: فهلك الناس إذا؟ فقال: إي والله يا ابن أعين هلك الناس أجمعون، قلت: من في الشرق ومن في الغرب؟ قال، فقال: إنها فتحت علي الضلال إي والله هلكوا إلا ثلاثة ثم لحق أبو ساسان، وعمار، وشتيرة، وأبو عمرة وصاروا سبعة

Hārith ibn Mughīrah al-Naṣarī said that he heard 'Abd al-Malik ibn A'yan continuously asking Abū 'Abd Allah questions. He eventually asked him, "Were all the people doomed to destruction then?"¹

Whereupon Abū 'Abd Allah said, "Yes, O son of A'yan! They were all doomed to destruction."

I said, "Those in the east and those in the west?"

He said, "Their lands were conquered with misguidance and, therefore, by the oath of Allah they were doomed to destruction besides three individuals. They were later joined by Abū Sāsān,² 'Ammār,³ Shatīrah,⁴ and Abū 'Amrah.⁵ They thus became seven."⁶

1 Meaning after the demise of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and the allegiance of the people to Abū Bakr (according to the Shī'ah).

2 Their scholar al-Ardabīlī says, "Abū Sāsān's name was Ḥusayn ibn Mundhir. It also said that his name was Abū Sinān." He then cites the narration of al-Kashshī (*Jāmi' al-Ruwāt* 2/387). Ibn Ḥajar has mentioned that he was rather known as Ḥuḍayn ibn al-Mundhir ibn al-Hārith al-Raqqāshī. He further says that he was one of the commanders of 'Alī رضي الله عنه in the Battle of Ṣiffīn. He was a reliable transmitter who passed away at the beginning of the second century. (*Taqrīb Al-Tahdhīb* 1/185).

3 Referring to 'Ammār ibn Yāsir.

4 Al-Ardabīlī says that Shatīrah was one of the companions of Amīr al-Mu'minīn. He then cites the narration of al-Kashshī for a second time. (*Jāmi' al-Ruwāt* 1/398)

5 Al-Ardabīlī says, "Abū 'Amrah al-Anṣārī's name was Tha'labah ibn 'Amr. He was from the elite companions of Amīr al-Mu'minīn. (*Jāmi' al-Ruwāt* 2/408). Ibn 'Abd al-Barr says, "Abū 'Amrah al-Anṣārī, there is difference of opinion regarding his name. Some say: 'Amr ibn Muḥṣan; some; Tha'labah ibn 'Amr ibn Muḥṣan; some; Bashīr ibn 'Amr ibn Muḥṣan ibn 'Atīk which is the correct name (if Allah wills). He was martyred in the Battle of Ṣiffīn whilst fighting alongside Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī." (*Al-Istī'āb* 4/133-134; *al-Iṣābah* 4/441; *Usd al-Ghābah* 5/263).

6 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 7.

Many of their narrations assert that the number of individuals did not increase more than this. Abū Ja‘far says:

وكانوا سبعة، فلم يكن يعرف حق أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام إلا هؤلاء السبعة

They were seven. Besides these seven no one acknowledged the right of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn.¹

Abū ‘Abd Allah used to actually take an oath and say:

فوالله ما وفي بها إلا سبعة نفر

By the oath of Allah! No one besides these seven fulfilled its right.²

Their narrations differ as to the specification of some of these seven.³ This difference is apparently because of the views of the various Shī‘ī sects about their personalities; every sect includes its own persons. Or maybe it is just due to contradiction and incoherence being the natural result of lying.

Nonetheless, these narrations still affirm the wholesale excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah and the possibility that these seven people (who were actually extremist deviants who adopted the names of these noble companions) were the first conspirators who spearheaded the movement of Shī‘ism. Because their attributes, mutual relationships and stances have no similarity with that of the Ṣaḥābah.

1 Ibid. p. 11-12.

2 *Al-Ikhtiṣāṣ* p. 63; al-Ḥimyarī: *Qurb al-Isnād* p. 38; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/322.

3 Do a comparison between this narration which I have cited here with reference to al-Kashshī and al-Ṭūsī and the narration which features in *Qurb al-Isnād* of al-Ḥimyarī. It reads as follows:

فوالله ما وفي بها إلا سبعة: سلمان و أبو ذر، وعمار، والمقداد بن الأسود، والكندي، وجابر بن عبد الله، ومولي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يدعي ثبिता، وزيد بن أرقم

By Allah only seven people fulfilled its right viz. Salmān, Abū Dhar, ‘Ammār, al-Miqdād ibn al-Aswad, al-Kindī, Jābir ibn ‘Abd Allah al-Anṣārī, a slave of Rasūl Allah ﷺ who was known as Thubayt, and Zayd ibn Arqam.” (*Qurb al-Isnād* p. 38; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/322).

Moving on, the Shī'ah at times¹ interpret the verses of the Qur'ān which laud the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ to refer to the three individuals whom they exclude from their blanket excommunication. Hence in *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, under the commentary of the verse:

إِنَّمَا الْمُؤْمِنُونَ الَّذِينَ إِذَا ذُكِرَ اللَّهُ وَجِلَتْ قُلُوبُهُمْ وَإِذَا تُلِيَتْ عَلَيْهِمْ آيَاتُهُ زَادَتْهُمْ إِيمَانًا وَعَلَىٰ رَبِّهِمْ يَتَوَكَّلُونَ الَّذِينَ يُقِيمُونَ الصَّلَاةَ وَمِمَّا رَزَقْنَاهُمْ يُنْفِقُونَ أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ حَقًّا ۚ لَهُمْ دَرَجَاتٌ عِنْدَ رَبِّهِمْ وَمَغْفِرَةٌ وَرِزْقٌ كَرِيمٌ

The believers are only those who, when God is mentioned, their hearts become fearful, and when His verses are recited to them, it increases them in faith; and upon their Lord they rely. The ones who establish prayer, and from what we have provided them, they spend.²

The following is mentioned:

فإنها نزلت في أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام، و أبي ذر و سلمان و المقداد

It was revealed regarding Amīr al-Mu'minīn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, Abū Dhar, Salmān, and al-Miqdād.³

But it did not occur to them that the Shī'ah commend these three individuals and consider them believers not because of the aforementioned attributes but because of their acknowledgement of the Imāmah of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the denial of the Imāmah of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. This factor, which differentiated them from the rest, is not mentioned in the verse which they claim is an attestation to their faith. Likewise is the case of all the other verses of the Qur'ān. They are thus a proof against them and not for them.

1 Because at other times they interpret them to mean their Imāms.

2 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 2, 3.

3 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/255; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/322.

Conversely, all the verses which contain the mention of disbelief, disbelievers, polytheism, and polytheists according to them refer to the rest of the Ṣaḥābah, as is mentioned in a number of chapters in *al-Kāfī* and *Biḥār al-Anwār*.¹

In spite of this blanket ruling regarding the apostasy of the Ṣaḥābah of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ﷺ, his helpers, and his bosom friends; they specifically revile and excommunicate the seniors among them. Their narrations in this regard are such that they leave the hair of the believers standing on ends.

Hence they have allotted the largest share of their onslaught to Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ—the ministers of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ and his relatives by law. In his *Biḥār al-Anwār*, which one of their contemporary scholars has regarded to be the only reliable source for understanding the different aspects of their dogma,² al-Majlisī has established a chapter by the title, *Chapter regarding the disbelief of the Three, their hypocrisy and their disgraceful actions*.³ Likewise their scholar al-Baḥrānī has also established many chapters on this topic:

Chapter no. 97: The sins of the Two who preceded Amīr al-Mu’minīn are like that of all the sins of the Believers till the Day of Judgment,⁴ and

Chapter no. 98: Regarding Iblīs having a higher rank than ‘Umar in Jahannam and that Iblīs has been given preference over him in the fire of Jahannam.⁵

Their narrations on this topic are steeped in disbelief. Hence at times they do not just excommunicate the *Shaykhayn* (Abū Bakr and ‘Umar) but assert that the greatest form of disbelief is to consider them Muslims. The author of *al-Kāfī* narrates:

1 See for example *al-Kāfī*: Chapter regarding the subtle indications to Wilāyah: 1/412-436: therein there are ninety two narrations. And also refer to p. 194 of this book.

2 Al-Baḥbūdī: *Muqaddamah al-Biḥār* p. 19.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 8/208-252.

4 *Al-Ma‘ālim al-Zulfā* 324.

5 Ibid. p.325.

ثلاثة لا يكلمهم الله يوم القيامة ولا يذكهم ولهم عذاب أليم: من ادعى إمامة من الله ليست له و من جحد إماما من الله، و من زعم أن لهما في الإسلام نصيبا.

Allah will not talk to and will not purify three people on the Day of Judgement and they will receive a very painful punishment:

1. He who falsely claims Imāmah from Allah ﷻ without it being his right,¹
2. He who denies the Imām selected by Allah,²
3. and he who claims that the Two of them have a share in Islam.³

And at times they describe them as the *Jibt* (superstition) and *Ṭāghūt* (idols).⁴ They at times curse them intensively, especially in the supplications which are rendered when visiting the shrines⁵. They have similarly replaced the devotions to be made after ṣalāh with cursing the Shaykhayn and all the Muslims.⁶

Some contemporary scholars who have written on the Shī'ah have disclosed some of their appalling traits with regards to the excommunication of the Ṣiddīq, the most truthful, of this Ummah and its *Fārūq*, the most apt differentiator between truth and falsehood.⁷ But I would like to add that in the writings of the scholars of the Safawid era the excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah is emphatic and clear. And in the writings of the earlier scholars who lived in the era of al-Kulaynī and thereafter it was subtle and euphemistic; the later Shī'ah scholars removed

1 This narration clearly excommunicates all the Muslim rulers till the Day of Judgment.

2 This is the excommunication of any person who does not believe in the Twelve Imāms which entails the excommunication of all the Muslims from the first to the last.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/373-374; al-Nu'mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 70; *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī* 1/178; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/111.

4 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/354.

5 *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh* 2/354.

6 *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* 10/354.

7 Like the writings of Mūsā Jār Allah in his book *al-Washī'ah* and that of Iḥsān Ilāhī Ṣāḥib in his book *al-Sunnah wa al-Shī'ah*.

the ambiguity of these euphemistic claims when to a certain extent the law of Taqiyyah was suspended (due to living under the Safawid rule) and the Twelver dogma came to the fore in its true colours.

For example, one of their special terms was naming the Shaykhayn, *al-Faṣīl* and *Ramʿ*. They did this because they did not have the courage to emphatically mention the names due to being under the mighty empire of Islam. The following appears In *Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī*:

قلت (الراوي يقول لإمامهم) ومن أعداء الله أصلحك الله؟ قال: الأوثان الأربعة، قال: قلت: من هم؟ قال:
أبو الفصيل، ورمع، ونعثل، و معاوية و من دان دينهم، فمن عادي هؤلاء فقد عادي أعداء الله

I said (the narrator), “Who are the enemies of Allah, may Allah keep you sound?”

He replied, “The four idols.”

I asked, “Who are they?”

He said, “Abū al-Faṣīl, Ramʿ, Naʿthal, and Muʿāwiyah. Likewise every person who treads their path. Whoever opposes them has indeed opposed the enemies of Allah.”¹

Their scholar, al-Majlisī, whilst explaining these terms says:

أبو الفصيل أبو بكر، لأن الفصيل و البكر متقاربان في المعني، و رمع مقلوب عمر، ونعثل هو عثمان

Al-Faṣīl is Abū Bakr, because the words Faṣīl and Bakr are almost synonymous². Ramuʿ is ʿUmar written backwards, and ‘Naʿthal’ is ʿUthmān.³

1 *Tafsīr al-ʿAyyāshī* 2/116; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/58.

2 Both mean ‘young camel’.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/58.

Likewise under the commentary of the verse:

لَهَا سَبْعَةُ أَبْوَابٍ لِّكُلِّ بَابٍ مِنْهُمْ جُزْءٌ مَّقْصُومٌ

It has seven gates; for every gate is of them [i.e., Satan's followers] a portion designated.¹

Al-'Ayyāshī has narrated the following from Abū Baṣīr who narrates from Abū Ja'far ibn Muḥammad:

يُؤْتِي بِهِمْ لَهَا سَبْعَةُ أَبْوَابٍ، بَابُهَا الْأَوَّلُ لِلظَّالِمِ وَهُوَ زُرَيْقٌ، وَبَابُهَا الثَّانِي لِحَبْرٍ، وَبَابُهَا الثَّلَاثُ لِلثَّلَاثِ، وَالرَّابِعُ لِمَعَاوِيَةَ، وَبَابُهَا الْخَامِسُ لِعَبْدِ الْمَلِكِ، وَبَابُهَا السَّادِسُ لِعَسْكَرِ بْنِ هَوْسَرٍ، وَبَابُهَا السَّابِعُ لِأَبِي سَلَامَةَ فَهُمْ أَبْوَابٌ لِمَنْ اتَّبَعَهُمْ

Jahannam will be brought and it will have seven doors. The first door is for the oppressor who is Zurayq. The second is for Ḥabtar, the third for the third, the forth for Mu'āwiyah, the fifth for 'Abd al-Malik, the sixth for 'Askar ibn Hawsar, and the seventh for Abū Salāmah. Hence they are the doors to Jahannam for whoever follows them.²

Al-Majlisī in explicating this narration mentions:

زُرَيْقٌ كُنْيَاةٌ عَنِ الْأَوَّلِ، لِأَنَّ الْعَرَبَ تَتَشَاءَمُ بِزُرْقَةِ الْعَيْنِ، وَالحَبْرُ هُوَ الثَّعْلَبُ، وَلَعَلَّهُ إِنَّمَا كُنِيَ عَنْهُ لِحِيلَتِهِ وَ مَكْرِهِ، وَفِي غَيْرِهِ مِنَ الْأَخْبَارِ وَقَعَ بِالْعَكْسِ وَهُوَ أَظْهَرُ، إِذِ الْحَبْرُ بِالْأَوَّلِ أَنْسَبُ وَيُمْكِنُ أَنْ يَكُونَ هُنَا أَيْضًا الْمُرَادُ ذَلِكَ، وَإِنَّمَا قَدِمَ الثَّانِي لِأَنَّهُ أَشَقِي وَأَفْظُ وَاغْلَظَ، وَ عَسْكَرُ ابْنِ هَوْسَرٍ كُنْيَاةٌ عَنْ بَعْضِ خُلَفَاءِ بَنِي أُمَيَّةٍ أَوْ بَنِي الْعَبَّاسِ، وَكَذَا سَلَامَةُ كُنْيَاةٌ عَنْ أَبِي جَعْفَرِ الدَّوَانِقِيِّ، وَيَحْتَمِلُ أَنْ يَكُونَ عَسْكَرُ كُنْيَاةٌ عَنْ عَائِشَةَ وَسَائِرِ أَهْلِ الْجَمَلِ إِذْ كَانَ اسْمُ جَمَلٍ عَائِشَةَ عَسْكَرًا وَرَوَى أَنَّهُ كَانَ شَيْطَانًا

“Zurayq” refers to the first one because the Arabs augur evil in the blueness of the eye. “Ḥabtar” means fox. Possibly he referred to the second one in this manner because of his cunningness and plotting. In some narrations

1 Sūrah al-Hijr: 44

2 Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī 2/243; al-Burhān 2/345.

the sequence is opposite, which is more correct because the title Ḥabtar suites the first one better. And possibly this is what is intended in this narration as well. However, the second one is mentioned first because of him being more wretched, callous, and staunch. “Askar ibn Hawsar” refers to one of the Umayyad or Abbasid rulers. Abū Salāmah refers to Abū Ja‘far al-Dawānīqī. It is also possible that ‘Askar refers to ‘Ā’ishah and all the participants of Battle of Jamal due to ‘Ā’ishah’s camel’s name being ‘Askar. One narration mentions that it was a devil.¹

Similarly, many of the narrations refer to Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا as ‘so and so’ and ‘so and so’, as in the following narration which is narrated from Abū ‘Abd Allah regarding the verse:

لَا تَتَّبِعُوا خُطُوَاتِ الشَّيْطَانِ

Do not follow the footsteps of Satan.²

وخطوات الشيطان والله ولاية فلان وفلان

He said, “The footsteps of Shayṭān by the oath of Allah was the rulership of ‘so and so’ and ‘so and so’.”³

Likewise regarding the verse:

أَوْ كُظُمَاتٍ فِي بَحْرٍ لُجِّيٍّ يَغْشَاهُ مَوْجٌ مِّنْ فَوْقِهِ مَوْجٌ مِّنْ فَوْقِهِ سَحَابٌ ظُلُمَاتٌ بَعْضُهَا فَوْقَ بَعْضٍ

Or [they are] like darknesses within an unfathomable sea which is covered by waves, upon which are waves, over which are clouds — darknesses, some of them upon others.⁴

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 4/378, 8/220.

2 *Sūrah al-Nūr*: 21.

3 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 1/102; *al-Burhān* 1/208; *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/242.

4 *Sūrah al-Nūr*: 40.

They say that “darknesses” refers to “so and so” and “so and so”, “within an unfathomable sea which is covered by waves” refers to Na‘thal, “upon which are waves” refers to Ṭalḥah and Zubayr, and “darknesses some of them upon the others” refers to Mu‘āwiyah.¹

Al-Majlisī says that “so and so” and “so and so” refers to Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما and “Na‘thal” refers to ‘Uthmān.²

Similarly, another set of titles which they use to refer to the Shaykhayn is what appears in the commentary of the verses:

وَالنَّهَارِ إِذَا جَلَّاهَا. وَاللَّيْلِ إِذَا يَغْشَاهَا

And [by] the day when it displays it. And [by] the night when it covers [i.e., conceals] it.³

The narration states that “and by the day when it displays it” refers to the emergence of the Mahdī and “and by the night when it covers it” refers to ‘Ḥabtar’ and ‘Dalām’ who covered the truth from him.⁴

Al-Majlisī, the grand scholar of Safawid Iran in his time, says that ‘Ḥabtar’ and ‘Dalām’ refer to Abū Bakr and ‘Umar.⁵

You will similarly find that when the later scholars narrated the reports of the early scholars’ books which contained subtle indications to the Shaykhayn, they changed the subtle indications with emphatic names.⁶

1 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/106; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 23/304-305.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 23/306.

3 *Sūrah al-Shams*: 3, 4.

4 *Kanz al-Fawā'id* p. 389-390; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/72-73.

5 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 24/73.

6 See: *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/301. He subtly indicates to the Shaykhayn with the titles ‘so and so’ and ‘so and so’. But when al-Kāshānī reports the narration from him he rather emphatically mentions the names (*Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 2/359).

They have likewise levelled apostasy and criticism against many other Ṣaḥābah and, in doing so, they always targeted the best among them and the most virtuous. So just as they revile and excommunicate the three Khulafā', they likewise do the same regarding the other virtuous and elite Ṣaḥābah, like 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Awf, Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, Abū 'Ubaydah ibn Jarrāḥ, and Sālim Mawlā Abī Ḥudhayfah. The following narration appears in *Tafsīr al-Qummī* and *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi*:

عن الصادق لما أقام رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم يوم غدیر خم كان بحذاءه سبعة نفر من المنافقين وهم: أبو بكر، وعمر، و عبد الرحمان بن عوف، و سعد بن أبي وقاص، و أبو عبيدة، و سالم مولي أبي حذيفة، و المغيرة بن شعبة قال عمر: أما ترون عينه كأنما عين مجنون يعني النبي. الساعة يقوم ويقول قال: لي ربي فلما قام قال: أيها الناس من أولي بكم من أنفسكم قالوا: الله و رسوله قال: اللهم فاشهد، ثم قال: ألا من كنت مولاه فعلي مولاه، و سلموا عليه بإمرة أمير المؤمنين فنزل جبرائيل و أعلم رسول الله بمقاله القوم فدعاهم و سألهم فأنكروا و حلفوا فأنزل الله يَحْلِفُونَ بِاللَّهِ مَا قَالُوا وَلَقَدْ قَالُوا كَلِمَةَ الْكُفْرِ

When Rasūl Allah ﷺ halted at Ghadīr Khum there were seven hypocrites by his side: Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Awf, Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, Abū 'Ubaydah, Sālim Mawlā Abī Ḥudhayfah, and Mughīrah ibn Shu'bah.

'Umar said,¹ "Don't you see that his eye looks like the eye of an insane person, i.e. the eye of Nabī. He will stand up now and say, "My Lord said to me..."²

Subsequent to that Nabī ﷺ stood up and said, "O people! Who is more deserving of you than yourselves?"

They replied, "Allah and his Rasūl."

1 This is the wording of *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi*. And in *Tafsīr al-Qummī* the wording is 'the second said'.

2 It is not unclear to an intelligent person that the fabricator of this statement intended to attack the integrity of Nabī ﷺ himself before anyone else. Because he wants the people to assume that if his close associates did not accept his message despite living with him and seeing his miracles then others would more so not accept his message. He likewise wants them to assume that he was an evil person who had evil companions, as was previously elucidated by the pious predecessors. The Shī'ah thus criticise Islam itself in a very deceitful and surreptitious way in order to misguide the gullible, i.e. by criticising the transmitter in order to discredit the transmitted.

Whereupon he said, “Behold! Whoever’s *mawlā* I am ‘Alī is his *mawlā*.”

The people thus acknowledged his message regarding the rule of Amīr al-Mu’minīn. Thereafter Jibrīl descended and informed Rasūl Allah of what the hypocrites had said. He thus called them and asked them. But they denied and took false oaths due to which Allah revealed the verse: *They swear by God that they did not say [anything against the Prophet] while they had said the word of disbelief*.¹

Similar to the attacks they have launched against these Ṣaḥābah, they have launched attacks against the other meritorious transmitters of Sharī’ah, like that of Abū Hurayrah,² Anas ibn Mālīk,³ al-Barā’ ibn ‘Āzib,⁴ Ṭalḥah, and Zubayr ibn al-‘Awwām,⁵ etc.

As for the comments and the remarks which their scholars have passed regarding these luminaries, they have blackened the pages. For you will not find a single book of theirs which deals with Imāmah or any issue of its sort void of excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah, their criticism, and curses upon them; such that no Muslim can ever fathom. This is obviously because they do not consider the Ṣaḥābah to be Muslims at all, and take them to be the most ardent enemies who oppressed them by pledging allegiance to Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. And because they were united in their times, they were brothers owing to the bounty of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, they established the Islamic empire, they conquered

1 *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 2/359; *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 1/301.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 22/242; *al-Khiṣāl* 1/190. A contemporary Shī‘ī scholar by the name of ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Mūsawī has written a book regarding Abū Hurayrah. Therein he concludes that he was a hypocrite and a disbeliever (See: Abū Hurayrah). And likewise study the responses written in the following: Muḥammad ‘Ajāj al-Khaṭīb p. 601; ‘Abd al-Mun‘im al-‘Azzī: *Difā’ ‘an Abī Hurayrah*; ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Zar‘ī: *Abū Hurayrah wa Aqlām al-Hāqīdīn*.

3 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 45.

4 *Ibid*.

5 They have said regarding the two of them, “They were both leaders from the leaders of disbelief.” (See: *Tafsīr al-Ayyāshī* 2/77-78; *al-Burhān* 2/107; *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 2/324).

lands, they spread Islam among the people, they distinguished the fire of fire worship, they destroyed the devil of idol worship, and they took the people out from the worship of servants to the worship of the Lord of the servants and their Creator. Their superiority and sovereignty thus incited the heretics and haters of those conquered lands, and the adherents of those false religions to conspire against the Ummah and destroy it under the disguise of *Tashayyu'*, partisanship for the Ahl al-Bayt. And naturally, due to the nature of their plot, the issue of Imāmah was their main target and what kept them continuously busy. Thereafter what ever happened, happened. Subsequent to that, their main strategy and the crux of their ploys formed the basis of the belief of the Shāh who, based on it, excommunicated the rulers and subjects. Ibn Bābawayh says:

فمن أدعى الإمامة و ليس بإمام فهو الظالم الملعون، و من وضع الإمامة في غير أهلها فهو ظالم ملعون

That person who claims leadership in spite of not being a leader is an accursed oppressor. Likewise a person who chooses anyone else besides the rightful is also an accursed oppressor.¹

So this is a blanket excommunication of all the rulers and their subjects throughout the ages (with the exception of 'Alī and Ḥasan of course).

When their scholar al-Mufīd, whom they accord the titles *Rukn al-Islām* (the pillar of Islam) and *Āyat Allāh al-Malik al-'Allām* (the proof of Allah, the Owner the All Knowing) was asked regarding the narration which states that Amīr al-Mu'mīnīn 'Alī عليه السلام said, "If any person who gives preference to me over Abū Bakr and 'Umar is brought to me, I will punish him with the punishment of a calumniator.", he said:

إن الوجه فيه أن المفاضل بينه و بين الرجلين إنما وجب عليه حد المفترى، لأن المفاضلة لا تكون إلا بين متقاربين في الفضل، و كان الرجلان بجحدهما النص قد خرجا عن الإيمان بطل أن يكون لهما فضل في الإسلام فكيف يحصل لهما من الفضل ما يقارب فضل أمير المؤمنين، و متي فضل إنسان أمير المؤمنين عليهما فقد افترى بالتفضيل لأمر المؤمنين عليهما، من حيث كذب في إثبات فضل لهم في الدين، و

1 *Al-I'tiqādāt* p. 112-113, *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/62.

جري في هذا الباب مجري من فضل المسلم البر التقي علي الكافر المرتد، و مجري من فضل جبرائيل علي إبليس، و رسول الله علي أبي جهل بن هشام

The reason why a person who draws a comparison between him and the two men is punished is that usually comparisons are only drawn between two people who are almost equal in virtue. But the two men, due to their denial of the Naṣṣ, turned apostate and it is thus invalid to assert that they enjoyed any merit in Islam. Therefore, how can a comparison be drawn between them and Amīr al-Mu'minīn in terms of merit. So when a person gives preference to Amīr al-Mu'minīn over them he, by doing so, lies in terms of according merit to them in dīn. He is thus like a person who gives preference to a noble Allah-conscious Muslim over an apostate disbeliever, and like a person who gives preference to Jibrīl over Iblīs, and Rasūl Allah over Abū Jahl ibn Hishām.¹

Consider, how he has equated the best individuals of this Ummah after its Nabī to Shayṭān and Abū Jahl. This surprisingly is the consensus of their scholars; he says:

فقد حصل الإجماع علي كفره (يعني عمر) بعد إظهاره الإيمان

Consensus has occurred regarding his apostasy (i.e. 'Umar) after he had outwardly expressed īmān.²

Likewise, al-Majlisī says:

و مما عد من ضروريات دين الإمامية استحلال المتعة، و حج التمتع، و البراءة من أبي بكر و عمر و عثمان و معاوية

Among those aspects which are considered to be categorically established in the dīn³ of the Imāmiyyah is to believe in the permissibility of Mut'ah,

1 *Al-'Uyūn wa al-Maḥāsīn* 2/122-123.

2 *Ibid.* 1/9.

3 See how he uses the word 'Dīn'. It indicates that the "dīn" of the Imāmiyyah is a dīn by itself which is different than the dīn of Islam. And without a doubt, based on what al-Majlisī has documented in his *Biḥār*, it is a dīn by itself which has nothing to do with dīn of Islam.

Ḥajj al-Tamattu', and to disassociate oneself from Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān, and Mu'āwiyah.¹

They also say that:

و من لم يبرأ من أبي بكر و عمر و عثمان فهو عدو و إن أحب عليا

A person who does not disassociate himself from Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān is an enemy even if he loves 'Alī عليه السلام.²

This is exactly why they consider cursing the three Khulafā', the other luminaries among the Ṣaḥābah, and some of the mothers of the believers; after every ṣalāh to be an act of worship. Al-Ḥurr al-Āmilī has established a chapter by the name, *Chapter regarding the desirability of cursing the enemies of dīn after every ṣalāh with their names*. Therein he cites the narration which al-Kulaynī reports on the authority of Thuwayr and Sirāj which reads as follows:

سمعنا أبا عبد الله رضي الله عنه و هو يلعن في دبر كل مكتوبة أربعة من الرجال و أربعة من النساء، فلانا و فلانا و فلانا (الخلفاء الثلاثة) و يسميهم و معاوية، و فلانة و فلانة (عائشة و حفصة رضي الله عنهما) و هنداً و أم الجكم أخت معاوية

We heard Abū 'Abd Allah cursing four men and four women after every ṣalāh: so and so, so and so, so and so (i.e. the three Khulafā'), he would take their names, Mu'āwiyah, so and so lady, so and so lady (referring to 'Ā'ishah and Ḥaḥṣah), Hind, and Umm al-Ḥakam—the sister of Mu'āwiyah.³

In *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* their scholar al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī has established a chapter named, *Chapter regarding the desirability of cursing the enemies of dīn after ṣalāh with their names*.⁴ Therein he cites many of their narrations, one them being the following:

1 Al-Majlisī: *Al-I'tiqādāt* p. 90-91.

2 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 5/389.

3 *Furū' al-Kāfī* 1/95; al-Ṭūsī: *Tahdhīb* 1/227; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 4/1037.

4 *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* 1/342.

إن من حقنا علي أوليائنا و أشياعنا أن لا يتصرف الرجل فيهم حتي يدعو بهذا الدعاء: اللهم...ضاعف لعنتك و بأسك و نكالك و عذابك علي اللذين كفرنا نعمتك، و خوفا رسولك، و حلا عقده في وصيه، و نبذا عهده في خليفته من بعده، و ادعيا مقامه، و غيرا أحكامه، و بدلا سنته، و قلبا دينه، و صغرا قدر حجتك و حججك، و بدءا بظلمهم، و طرقا طريق الغدر عليهم، و الخلاف عن أمرهم، و القتل لهم...و منعا خليفتك من سد الثلم، و تقويم العوج، و إمضاء الأحكام، و إظهار دين الإسلام، و إقامة حدود القرآن، اللهم العنهما، و ابنتيهما، و كل من مال ميلهم، و حذا حذوهم، و سلك طريقهم و تصدرب بدعتهم لعنا لا يخطر علي البال، و يستعذ منه أهل النار، العن اللهم من دان بقولهم، و أتبع أمرهم، و دعا إلي ولايتهم، و شك في كفرهم من الأولين و الآخرين

Abū ‘Abd Allah said, “It is our right upon our partisans and associates that none of them should leave until he supplicates thus, ‘O Allah, double your curse, your grip, your exemplary punishment, and your chastisement upon the two who denied your bounty, threatened your prophet, breached his bequest regarding his successor, did away with his order regarding the Khalīfah after him, wrongly assumed his space, adulterated his decisions, changed his ways, interpolated his dīn, underestimated your evidence and proofs, oppressed them, treaded the path of violence, opposition, and murder against them. They stopped your Khalīfah from blocking the cracks, straightening the crookedness, establishing the commands, expressing the dīn of Islam, and reviving the injunctions of the Qur’ān. O Allah, curse them, their daughters, and every person who has the same tendencies, who treads their path, follows them in their ways, and openly proclaims their innovations. Curse them in a manner that the mind cannot fathom and wherefrom the people of Jahannam seek refuge. Curse every person from the first and the last who accepts their views, follows their orders, advocates their leadership, and doubts their disbelief.¹

See how they, by means of these wretched words, curse all the Muslims from the first to the last, and how they specifically curse and excommunicate the two individuals who established the dīn of Islam after Rasūl Allah ﷺ and spread the dīn of Allah far and wide. Notice how they consider them and whoever followed them to be the enemies of dīn. So which dīn do these people, who regard the Ṣaḥābah and those who meticulously followed them the enemies of dīn,

¹ Ibid.

follow? It can be any other dīn but not the dīn of Islam. These curses approve the fact that the one who forged them was one of the followers of those ancient religions which Islam destroyed under the rule of Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and their brothers in Islam.

Likewise, through these prayers, the planting of hatred, the spreading of acrimony and the provocation of enmity take place regularly in their shrines in the form of continuously cursing the people of the best era. Hence when visiting the grave of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا they curse Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the rest of the Ṣaḥābah saying:

السلام عليك يا فاطمة، يا سيدة نساء العالمين! لعن الله مانعك إرثك ودافعك عن حقك، والراد عليك قولك. لعن الله أشياعهم وأتباعهم وألحقهم بدرك الجحيم

Pease be upon you, O Fāṭimah, O the queen of the women of the world. May Allah curse the one who deprived you of your inheritance, prevented you from your right, and rejected what you had to say. May Allah curse their supporters and their followers. May Allah make them reach the Fire of Jahannam.¹

It should be noted that the person who fabricated this prayer intended to curse the most truthful of the Ummah and then all his followers by extension. Hence Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is also implicated, because he was definitely from the supporters of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and his helpers, which was certainly not unknown to the fabricator of this prayer. However he is an enemy of all of them who feigns partisanship of the Ahl al-Bayt. Because the Shī‘ah easily buy into such narrations due to the absence of reason and intellect as a result of their overwhelming emotions (mostly based on lies) regarding the sufferings of the Ahl al-Bayt, the oppression they underwent, the discarding of their rights, and their continuous conflict with the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. In this regard they have compiled a huge amount of stories which leave the heart of a believer

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār*: Chapter regarding visiting Fāṭimah 100/197. Also refer to p. 198 and p. 200 of the same volume.

filled with hatred, the desire for vengeance, and the thirst for spilling blood; as is apparent from their current condition.¹

The Alleged Shortcomings of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ:

Together with the excommunication and the cursing of the Ṣaḥābah they have filled their books with the alleged shortcomings of the Ṣaḥābah as well.² Some scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah have busied themselves in countering them,³ but what is important to understand in this regard is that the Shī'ah use all of these accusations as a cover for the underlying reason for their stance regarding the Ṣaḥābah. This is because even if the Ṣaḥābah were hypothetically infallible and indifferent to vice and evil, the Shī'ah would still not be pleased with them. Because their greatest crime was their allegiance to Abū Bakr and not to 'Alī. And every crime can be forgiven but not this one. Just as they aver that a person who has sins equal to the earth will be forgiven if he believes in Imāmah.

1 See for example some of their fallacious narrations regarding the alleged conflict with regards to the bequest of Rasūl Allah ﷺ which they attribute to al-Mas'ūdī (*Murūj al-Dhahab* p. 122, onwards).

2 Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī: *Minhāj al-Karāmah* p. 132.

3 Ibn Taymiyah has answered all the allegations that the Shī'ah raise on this topic in detail. He also gives a brief answer which can be summarised thus:

1. Among them some are blatant lies. And some have been distorted with additions and omissions which make them seem as if they are allegations. Most of the demerits and allegations which they raise are of this type. They are reported by liars and fabricators like Abū Mikhnaf Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā, Hishām ibn al-Sā'ib al-Kalbī, and others; regarding whose lies and dubious narrations the scholars are unanimous.
2. Some of them are true, but in most of them the Ṣaḥābah had genuine reasons and excuses which take them out of the realm of sin and make them part of those issues which require *Ijtihād* (deliberation), wherein a person receives double reward if he reaches the correct conclusion and one reward if he does not. Most of the issues reported regarding the first three *Khulafā'* are of this nature.

Even if we hypothetically consider those actions to be outright evil, they do not in any way taint their virtues, feats, and the aspect of them being from the people of Jannah. Because the punishment of a confirmed sin can be lifted in the Hereafter for many reasons, some being: repentance, good deeds which wipe out evil deeds, and calamities which expiate the sins of a person. (*Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/19).

Al-Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār realised this and therefore advised:

و كثيرا تسأل الإمامية عما كان من عثمان في تولية أقاربه و غير ذلك، و في سير طلحة و الزبير و عائشة إلى البصرة، و ما ذاك إلا لضعفهم و انقطاعهم، لأن عثمان لو لم يول أقاربه و لم يصنع ما صنع لكان كافرا مشركا عندهم بادعائه الإمامة لنفسه، ولأبي بكر و عمر، و لو كان طلحة و الزبير و عائشة في عسكر أمير المؤمنين و في المحاربين معه ما كانوا إلا مشركين باعتقادهم إمامة أبي بكر و عمر و عثمان، فمن يكلم الإمامية في إثارتهم لهذه المسائل كمن يكلم اليهود في وجوب النية في الطهارة، أو يكلم النصارى في استحلالهم الخمر، و إنما يكلم في هذا من قال لا ذنب لعثمان إلا ما أتاه من الحمي، و تولية الأقارب، و لولا ذلك لكان مثل عمر، و من قال لا ذنب لطلحة و الزبير و عائشة إلا مسيرهم إلى البصرة، و لولا ذلك لكان مثل أبي عبيدة و عبد الرحمان و ابن مسعود. فاعرف هذا ولا تكلمهم فيه البتة، و كلمهم فيها يدعونه من النص فهو الأصل

Many a times the Imāmiyyah ask regarding ‘Uthmān appointing his relatives, and regarding Ṭalḥah, Zubayr, and ‘Ā’ishah going to Baṣrah. They ask regarding these aspects because of their weakness and inability. Even if ‘Uthmān did not appoint his relatives and he did not do what he did, he would still have been considered a disbeliever and a polytheist because of claiming leadership for himself and for Abū Bakr and ‘Umar. And even if Ṭalḥah, Zubayr, and ‘Ā’ishah were part of the army of Amīr al-Mu’minīn and were among those who fought with him, they would have still been polytheists because of them believing in the leadership of Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Uthmān. So a person who debates the Imāmiyyah in these issues is like a person who debates a Jew in the issue of intention being compulsory when doing ablution, or like a person who debates a Christian regarding the permissibility of wine. Therefore, a person should only debate a person who claims that the only mistakes ‘Uthmān made were the designation of a sanctuary and the appointment of his relatives to government offices; if it was not for these issues he would have been like ‘Umar. Or a person who claims that the only wrong that Ṭalḥah, Zubayr, and ‘Ā’ishah committed was their going to Baṣrah, otherwise they would have been like Abū ‘Ubaydah, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, and Ibn Mas’ūd. So do not talk to them regarding these issues. But talk to them regarding the Naṣṣ that they claim, for that is the basis of their dogma.¹

1 *Tathbīt Dalā’il al-Nubuwwah* 1/294.

The Ahl al-Bayt

The aforementioned narrations which explicitly excommunicate the unique and exemplary generation (and which do not exclude more than seven people in their estimates), do not exclude as part of these seven any of the members of the household of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. Besides one narration which exclude ‘Alī رضي الله عنه only. This is the narration of Fūḍayl ibn Yasār which he narrates from Abū Ja‘far:

قال: صار الناس كلهم أهل جاهلية إلا أربعة: علي، و المقداد، و سلمان، و أبو ذر فقلت: فعمار، فقال: إن كنت تريد الذين لم يدخلهم شيء فهو لاء الثلاثة

All the people reverted to ignorance besides four: ‘Alī, Miqdād, Salmān, and Abū Dhar.

[The narrator says,] I asked, “What about ‘Ammār?”

He said, “If you want to know those people who did not have any doubt, then they are these three.”¹

Hence, the ruling of apostasy is inclusive of the Ṣaḥābah and the household of Rasūl Allah ﷺ which comprised of his wives and his relatives, yet the fabricator of this narration claims to be a supporter of the household of Nabī ﷺ notwithstanding. So is this not evidence of the fact that the ‘partisanship’ for the Ahl al-Bayt is just a pretext which is being exploited in order to accomplish malicious objectives against Islam and its adherents? And of the fact that the fabricators of these narrations are the enemies of both the Ṣaḥābah and the Household of Nabī ﷺ? It is not far-fetched to assume that the names which are excluded do not really have personalities behind them, rather they were assumed by the first conspirators and spearheaders of Shī‘ism; they do not in any way refer to the Ṣaḥābah. Why then were the members of the Ahl al-Bayt not mentioned with them? And why are any of these Ṣaḥābah not reported to have remonstrated and boycotted the first two Khulafā’, but rather are reported to have supported them and loved them?

1 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 1/199; *al-Burhān* 1/319; *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1/389.

Based on the aforementioned narrations, they have passed the ruling of apostasy regarding Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, the family of ‘Aqīl, the family of Ja‘far, the family of ‘Abbās, the consorts of Rasūl Allah ﷺ—the mothers of the believers.

Instead the Shī‘ah have made specific members of the Ahl al-Bayt targets of their criticism and excommunication, like the uncle of Nabī ﷺ ‘Abbās, for they say that the following verse was revealed regarding him:

وَمَنْ كَانَ فِي هَذِهِ أَعْمَىٰ فَهُوَ فِي الْآخِرَةِ أَعْمَىٰ وَأَضَلُّ سَبِيلًا

And whoever is blind in this [life] will be blind in the Hereafter and more astray in way.¹

And like his son, ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Abbās, the great scholar of this Ummah and the interpreter of the Qur‘ān. The narration of *al-Kāfī* suggests his excommunication and that he was an ignorant and obtuse person.² The narration of *Rijāl a-Kashshī* reads as follows:

اللهم العن ابني فلان واعم أبصارهما، كما عميت قلوبهما. واجعل عمي أبصارهم دليلا علي عمي قلوبهما

O Allah curse the two sons of so and so and blind their vision just as you have blinded their hearts, and make the blindness of their eyes a proof of the blindness of their hearts.³

Their scholar Ḥasan al-Muṣṭafawī has commented on this narration thus:

هما عبد الله بن عباس و عبدة بن عباس

This refers to ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Abbās and ‘Ubayd Allah ibn ‘Abbās.⁴

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 53. And the verse is verse no. 72 of Sūrah al-Isrā’.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/247.

3 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 53.

4 Ibid.

The daughters of Rasūl Allah ﷺ are likewise victims of the anger of the Shī'ah and their hatred, for they are also not mentioned amongst those who are excluded from the blanket excommunication. Instead some have even gone to the extent of saying that besides Fāṭimah, the others were not the daughters of Rasūl Allah ﷺ.¹ Is it really possible for someone who makes such claims regarding the daughters of Nabī ﷺ to love him?

The author of *al-Kāfī* has very explicitly mentioned that whoever does not believe in the Imāmah of the Twelve Imāms is a disbeliever even if he be from the family of 'Alī and Fāṭimah رضي الله عنهما.² This verdict in reality entails the excommunication of the first generation which comprised of both the Ṣaḥābah and the Ahl al-Bayt. Because none of them had knowledge about the doctrine of the Twelve Imāms which only came into existence after the year 260 A.H.

They have also excommunicated all the wives of Nabī ﷺ, for they have not excluded any of them as well in their narrations. But from among all of them they specifically target 'Ā'ishah³ and Ḥaḥṣah⁴ رضي الله عنهما with criticisms, curses, and apostasy. Hence their scholar al-Majlisī has established a chapter titled, *Chapter regarding the conditions of 'Ā'ishah and Ḥaḥṣah*. Therein he cites seventeen narrations⁵ and for the rest of them he refers the reader to the other chapters.⁶ They have caused a great deal of pain to Rasūl Allah ﷺ in these narrations.

1 Ja'far al-Najafī: *Kashf al-Ghiṭā'* p. 5; Ḥasan al-Amīn: *Dā'irat Ma'ārif al-Shī'ah* 1/27.

2 *Al-Kāfī*: Chapter regarding a person who claims Imāmah without being deserving thereof, and a person who denies all the Imāms or some of them, and a person who concedes it for someone who is not rightful: 1/372-374.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/300; *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 57-60; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 53/90.

4 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/246.

5 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/227-247.

6 He says, "Some of the incidents of 'Ā'ishah have passed in the chapters regarding the marriage of Khadījah, and the children of Rasūl Allah ﷺ in the narration which states that she accused Māriyah due to which the verse of Ifk were revealed (see how they distort the reality). The rest of her incidents will come in the narrations of the Battle of Jamal." (*Biḥār al-Anwār* 22: 245).

They have gone to the extent of accusing of adultery the one whom Allah ﷻ vindicated from above the seven heavens, ‘Ā’ishah—the truthful, the daughter of the truthful. This repugnant allegation¹ features in their most canonical work on

1 The text reads as follows:

قال علي بن إبراهيم في قوله (وضرب الله مثلاً) ثم ضرب الله فيها (يعني عائشة و حفصة زوجتي رسول الله صلى الله وسلم) مثلاً فقال: ضَرَبَ اللَّهُ مَثَلًا لِلَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا امْرَأَتَ نُوحٍ وَامْرَأَتَ لُوطٍ كَانَتَا تَحْتَ عَبْدَيْنِ مِنْ عِبَادِنَا صَالِحِينَ فَخَانَتَاهُمَا. قال: والله ما عني بقوله فخانتهما إلا الفاحشة، وليقيم الحد علي فلانة فيما أنت في طريق البصرة، وكان فلان يحبها، فلما أرادت أن تخرج إلي البصرة قال لها فلان: لا يحل لك أن تخرجين-كذا- من غير محرم. فزوجت نفسها من فلان

‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī mentions regarding the verse, and Allah presents an example of those who disbelieved, “Then Allah presents an example regarding the two of them (i.e. ‘Ā’ishah and Ḥafṣah, the wives of Nabī ﷺ), hence he says, “And Allah presents an example of those who disbelieved: the wife of Nuḥ and the wife of Lūṭ. They were under two of our righteous servants but betrayed them...” By Allah he did not intend anyone but the obscene lady in “but they betrayed them”. He will most certainly establish the punishment upon so and so for the crime she perpetrated on the way to Baṣrah. So and so used to love her, so when she wanted to leave for Baṣrah then so and so said to her, “You cannot leave without a Maḥram.” So she married herself to him...

(This is the text of al-Qummī as documented by al-Majlisī in *Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/240. As for the text from the exegesis of al-Qummī itself, the text does feature there. But the person who revised the book omitted the word Baṣrah which appears twice and replaced it with dots. (See: *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/377). This text does not explicitly mention names. So who is meant in the statement, “He will most certainly establish the punishment,” and who are meant by ‘so and so lady’ and ‘so and so man’? The Shaykh of the Shī‘ah, al-Majlisī, due to living under the Safawid rule, has removed the veil of Taqiyyah and has explicitly mentioned the names. He says, “He will most certainly establish the punishment upon her refers to the Mahdī when he will return, as will be mention ahead (I have cited the text he is referring to under the discussion of *Ghaybah*. Therein he explicitly mentions the name of ‘Ā’ishah. However, he alleges that the reason for her punishment is the accusation she levelled against Māriyah; he does not boldly accuse her there of that which he accuses her of here). And ‘so and so man’ refers to Ṭalḥah. (*Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/241).

This text as you have seen, appears in the exegesis of al-Qummī which is classed a reliable source by their contemporary scholars. The reviser thereof does not critique his exegesis in any way. Hence this an indictment to them and their predecessors. The reviser of *Biḥār al-Anwār* has, however, commented upon this text but in defence of their scholar al-Qummī and not in defence of ‘Ā’ishah the mother of the believers. She does not require the testification of anyone to her chastity after the testification of Allah in her favour, but I am just mentioning this to show the gravity of their slander.

Qur'ānic exegesis (the exegesis of al-Qummī) which implies the refutation of the Qur'an. In his exegesis of Sūrah al-Nūr, Ibn Kathīr mentions the following:

أجمع أهل العلم -رحمهم الله- قاطبة علي أن من سبها ورمأها بما رماها به بعد هذا الذي ذكر في الآية فإنه كافر، لأنه معاند للقرآن

The people of knowledge unanimously conquer that a person who accuses her of what he (the leader of the hypocrites Ibn Salūl) accused her of after the revelation of these verses is a disbeliever. Because he is opposing the Qur'an.¹

And al-Qurtūbī says:

فكل من سبها مما برأها الله منه مكذب لله، و من كذب الله فهو كافر

Anyone who accuses her of that which Allah exonerated her from has belied Allah, and whoever belies Allah is a disbeliever.²

Nonetheless, the phenomenon of excommunication is not restricted to the Ṣaḥābah even though they were the first victims thereof due to them being the bearers of the Shar'ah, the transmitters of the Qur'an and the Sunnah, and the conveyers of the dīn on behalf of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. Hence reviling them is in actual fact reviling dīn;³ this was the goal of the heretics in attacking them. And to date, excommunication continues unabated in their circles.

The Muslim Rulers and their Governments

According to the Twelver dogma every government besides the government of the Twelvers is invalid and the ruler thereof is a tyrant and an idol who has been deified. Likewise, whoever pledges allegiance to him is an idolater who worships others besides Allah.

1 *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 3/289-290. Also see: Ibn Taymiyah: *al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl* p. 571.

2 *Tafsīr al-Qurtūbī* 12/206.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/5.

Al-Kulaynī has established this in many chapters, for example, *Chapter regarding a person who claims Imāmāh for himself without being worthy, regarding a person who denies the Imāms or some of them and regarding a person who affirms Imāmāh for someone who is not eligible*. In this chapter he cites twelve narrations from their Imāms.¹ Likewise, *Chapter regarding a person who adheres to the commands of Allah without an appointed Imām from him. Therein there are five narrations*.² In *Biḥār al-Anwār* the following chapter features, *Chapter regarding the punishment for a person who claims Imāmāh unrightfully, who raises the banner of tyranny or adheres to a tyrant ruler*.³

So all the rulers of the Muslims, with the exception of ‘Alī and Ḥasan, are idols (according to their belief) even though they called toward the truth, revered the Ahl al-Bayt, and established the dīn of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. For as they allege:

كل راية قبل راية القائم رضي الله عنه صاحبها طاغوت

Every flag which is raised before the flag of the Mahdī, the raiser thereof is an idol.⁴

The commentator of *al-Kāfī* comments thus:

وإن كان رافعها يدعو إلي الحق

Even though the raises thereof calls toward the truth.⁵

And al-Majlisī has classed this narration ‘authentic’⁶ according to their principles.

1 *Al-Kāfī*: 1/372-374.

2 *Al-Kāfī*: 1/274-276.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/110, onwards.

4 *Al-Kāfī* with the commentary of al-Māzindarānī 12/371; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/113.

5 Al-Māzindarānī: *Sharḥ al-Jāmi’* 12/371; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/113.

6 *Mir’āt al-‘Uqūl* 4: 378.

As for those rulers who ruled before the year 260 A.H, al-Majlisī says the following regarding the *al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidūn*, the rightly guided successors of Rasūl Allah ﷺ:

إنهم لم يكونوا إلا غصبين جائرین مرتدين عن الدين لعنة الله عليهم وعلي من اتنعهم في ظلم أهل البيت من الأولين و الآخرين

They were not but usurpers, tyrants, and renegades. May the curse of Allah be upon them and upon those who followed them in their oppression against the Ahl al-Bayt from the first and the last.¹

The Muslim Metropolises

In many of their narrations the excommunication of many of the Muslim cities features. They specifically target those cities the inhabitants of which are devout Muslim who adhere to the Sunnah. Hence, they have excommunicated the people of Makkah and the people of Madīnah in the golden eras. Ja'far al-Şādiq is reported to have said the following regarding the people of Makkah and Madīnah:

أهل الشام شر من أهل الروم (يعني شر من النصاري) وأهل المدينة شر من أهل مكة، وأهل مكة يكفرون بالله جهرة

The people of Syria are worse than the people of Rome (i.e. worse than the Christians). And the people of Madīnah are worse than the people of Makkah, and the people of Makkah openly disbelieve in Allah.²

Abū Başīr narrates from one of the two Imāms that he said:

إن أهل مكة ليكفرون بالله جهرة وإن أهل المدينة أحببت من أهل مكة، أحببت منهم سبعين ضعفا

The people of Makkah openly disbelieve in Allah and the people of Madīnah are worse than the people of Makkah by seventy times.³

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 4: 385.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/409.

3 *Ibid.* 2/410.

It is a known fact that the people of Madīnah, especially in the golden eras, abided more to the teachings of Rasūl Allah ﷺ than the people of any other city. This is exactly why one of the scholars of Islam considered the consensus of the people of Madīnah to be evidence upon those besides them.¹

The people of Madīnah adhered to their ancient school of thought by remaining affiliated to the school of thought of Imām Mālik till the beginning of the sixth century or some time before that or some time after that. Till eventually the Shī'ah from the east infiltrated them and corrupted many of them.²

This adherence to Islam enraged many of the heretics due to which they expressed their hatred in these kinds of words. And history repeats itself. So we find that one of their scholars said that Makkah is governed by a group of people who are worse than the Jews.³

One of their contemporary scholars has disclosed and explicated the reason behind the aforementioned narrations in his footnotes on *al-Kāfī*. He says:

لعل هذا الكلام في زمن بني أمية وأتباعهم، كانوا منافقين يظهرون الإسلام و يطنون الكفر، والمنافقون شر من الكفار وهم في الدرك الأسفل من النار..و.و.و. يحتمل أن يكون هذا مبنيًا علي أن المخالفين غير المستضعفين مطلقًا شر من سائر الكفار كما يظهر من كثير من الاخبار

This possibly refers to the era of the Umayyads who outwardly expressed īmān but inwardly concealed disbelief. And hypocrites are worse than disbelievers and they deserve the lower most section of Jahannam... It

1 It is famous regarding Mālik and his students that they would consider the consensus of the people of Madīnah to be evidence. The other scholars have disputed this stance of theirs. However, it is only the consensus of those golden ages which is evidence. As for the times that followed, all the scholars are unanimous that the consensus of the people thereof is not evidence. (*Majmū' Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 20/300)

2 *Al-Fatāwā* 20/299-300.

3 The mention of this will come ahead under the topic of the empire of the Ayatollahs. In the fourth section of the book.

is also possible that it based on the fact that the opposition (besides the weak) in general is far worse than the disbelievers, as is understood from many of the narrations.¹

So according to him, he feels that this excommunication is correct and concludes that they are worse than the believers for one of two reasons: either because of their submission to the Umayyads i.e. because of them pledging allegiance to the Muslim Umayyad rulers which according to them is the greatest hypocrisy. Or because, as a matter of fact, the opposition (of the Shī'ah) are according to them worse than the disbelievers. Based on this explanation, the excommunication becomes inclusive of all the Muslim lands throughout the ages.

They also say the following regarding Egypt and its people:

أبناء مصر لعنوا علي لسان داود عليه السلام، فجعل الله منهم القردة والخنازير و ما غضب الله علي بني إسرائيل إلا أدخلهم مصر، ولا رضي عنهم إلا أخرجهم منها إلي غيرها

The people of Egypt were cursed upon the tongue Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, hence Allah disfigured them into monkeys and pigs.² Whenever Allah was displeased with Banī Isrā'īl, he took them to Egypt, and whenever he was pleased with them he removed them from there to another place.³

Consider the following two narrations as well:

بئس البلاد مصر أما إنها سجن من سخط الله عليه من بني اسرائيل

The worst of cities is Egypt. It is a prison of the wrath of Allah for the Banī Isrā'īl.⁴

انتهبوا مصر ولا تطلبوا المكث فيها لأنه يورث الديانة

1 'Alī Akbar al-Ghifārī: *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/409-410 (footnote).

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 60/208; *Tafsīr al-Qummī* p. 596.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 60/208-209; *Qurb al-Isnād* p. 220; *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī* 1/304; *al-Burhān* 1/456.

4 *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī* 1/305; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 60/210; *al-Burhān* 1/457.

Stay away from Egypt and do not desire to stay there. Because staying there breeds indecency.¹

They have many other narrations of this nature wherein they talk evil of Egypt, criticise its people, and warn others from residing in it. They have attributed these narrations to Rasūl Allah ﷺ, Muḥammad al-Bāqir, and ‘Alī al-Riḍā. This is how the Shī‘ah view the Egypt of the glorious days of Islam. Hence after citing these narrations, al-Majlisī comments thus:

بأن مصر صارت من شر البلاد في تلك الأزمنة، لأن أهلها صاروا من أشقي الناس وأكثرهم

Egypt became the worst of places in those times. Because its people became the most wretched of people and the most ungrateful.²

All of this venting is because its people did not buy into Shī‘ism. And it is possible that these narrations were forged before or after the Ismā‘īlī government in Egypt. Because the Twelvers will never oppose anyone who is like them in Shī‘ism, or who establishes an empire wherein their disbelief will be tolerated.

It is not likewise far-fetched to assume that these narrations are a reflection of the hatred and the acrimony the Shī‘ah harbour for Egypt due to the fall of the Ismā‘īlī rule therein at the hands of the great general Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn, who purified the land of Kinānah from their defilement and impurities. Furthermore, do a comparison between these narrations and the narrations which Imām Muslim has cited in his book under the chapter, *The bequest of Rasūl Allah ﷺ regarding the people of Egypt*.³

Nonetheless, they have made disparaging remarks regarding many of the cities of Islam and their inhabitants. With the exception of a very few cities which hold the Shī‘ī viewpoint, they have not excluded any other city. Hence they say:

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 60/211.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 2/2970.

3 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 2/2970.

إن الله عرض ولايتنا علي أهل الأمصار فلم يقبلها إلا أهل الكوفة

Allah ﷻ presented our allegiance to the people of the cities but no one besides the people of Kūfah accepted.¹

The Muslim Judges

Their narrations consider the Muslim judges as transgressors because of their association with illegitimate governments as they allege. In *al-Kāfī* the following narration is narrated from ‘Umar ibn Ḥanzalah.

سألت أبا عبد الله عليه السلام عن رجلين من أصحابنا بينهما منازعة في دين أو ميراث فتحاكما إلي السلطان و إلي القضاة أيحل ذلك؟ قال: من تحاكم إليهم في حق أو باطل فإنما تحاكم إلي الطاغوت، وما يحكم له فإنما يأخذ سحتا، وإن كان حقا ثابتا له، لأنه أخذ بحكم الطاغوت، وقد أمر الله أن يكفر به. قال تعالى: يُرِيدُونَ أَنْ يُتَحَاكَمُوا إِلَى الطَّاغُوتِ وَقَدْ أُمِرُوا أَنْ يَكْفُرُوا بِهِ

He says, “I asked Abū ‘Abd Allah regarding two people from our community who due to a dispute in a matter of religion or inheritance referred to the ruler and the judges; I asked that is it permissible for them to do so?”

He said, “Whoever goes to them for a judgement in reality is going to the *Ṭāghūt*.² And whatever right he acquires due to the ruling being passed in his favour is impermissible for him even though it be his established right. This is because he took it with the judgement of the *Ṭāghūt* whom Allah ﷻ has ordered not to believe. Allah says, ‘They wish to refer legislation to the *Ṭāghūt* while they were commanded to reject it.’”³

So as you can see, they consider the Muslim judges to be idols or devils, and their rulings to be invalid; to the extent that a person who procures his right through them is procuring Ḥarām. This ruling is general regarding all the Muslims

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 60/209 (with reference to *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt*)

2 Transgressor, devil, idol.

3 *Sūrah al-Nisā’*: 60. And the narration appears in *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/67.

throughout the centuries and across all generations. Hence it necessarily includes the judges in the time of Ja'far al-Šādiq, as is clear from their attribution of the narration to Ja'far. So if this is their opinion regarding the judges of the best generations, then what would the status of the judges that followed thereafter be?

It seems as though they all exalt only those judges who pass judgements based on the tales of *al-Riqā'*, the huge lamb-skin, the *Jāmi'ah* (which according to them encompasses the knowledge of everything), the *Muṣḥaf* of Fāṭimah, and the rulings of the family of Dāwūd. They are not required to provide evidence as appears in their narrations.¹ They do not exalt judges who issue rulings in accordance with the Qur'ān, the Sunnah, and the consensus of the Ummah. Hence they themselves are the purport of this verse which they use to substantiate their case, for it was revealed regarding some hypocrites who gave preference to the judgement of the *Ṭāghūt* over the judgement of Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allah ﷺ.² Which is not unusual, because these *Shī'ah* belong to the category of the hypocrites.

The stance of their scholars has not changed in the least in these times. Hence after the aforementioned narration Khomeini comments thus:

الإمام عليه السلام نفسه ينعي عن الرجوع إلى السلاطين و قضائهما و يعتبر الرجوع إليهم رجوعاً إلى الطاغوت

The Imām prohibits going to their rulers and judges. And considers their rulings to be the rulings of the devil.³

And the commentator of *al-Kāfi* mentions:

والآية بتأييد الخبر تدل علي عدم الترافع إلي حكم الجور مطلقاً، و ربما قيل بجواز التوسل بهم إلي أخذ الحق المعلوم، اضطراراً مع عدم إمكان الترافع إلي الفقيه العدل

1 See: Chapter regarding Sunnah and the discussion regarding belief in the books. Likewise see the chapter regarding occultation.

2 *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 8/507; *Tafsīr al-Baghawī* 1/446.

3 *Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 74.

The verse together with the support of the narration posits that one should not take his case to the oppressive rulers at all. However, at times permission is granted to procure one's right through their medium when it is not possible to take the case to an upstanding jurist.¹

However, it seems as if these principles, which were concocted by the heretics, did not gain acceptance by many of their followers. Because they find such justice by the Muslim judges which they do not find by their people. Some have even acknowledged before Ibn Taymiyyah that:

أَنتُمْ (يعني أهل السنة) تنصفوننا ما لا ينصف بعضنا بعضا

You people are more just to us than we are to each other.²

Some of their men likewise complained to the Imām that they find more trustworthiness, good character, and decorum by the Ahl al-Sunnah and find the opposite traits in the Shī'ah which makes them grieve.³

The Imāms of the Muslims and their Scholars

They have prevented their people from acquiring knowledge from the scholars of the Muslims and they have considered them to be like the people of Shirk:

عن هارون بن خارجه قال: قلت لأبي عبد الله عليه السلام: إنا نأتي هؤلاء المخالفين فنسمع منهم الحديث يكون حجة لنا عليهم؟ قال: لا تأتهم ولا تسمع منهم بعينهم الله، ولعن ملكهم المشركة

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/67 (footnotes)

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/39. A judge from the Ahl al-Sunnah who is appointed as a judge in an area which is populated by the Shī'ah told me that the Shī'ah are keen on bringing their cases to the Ahl al-Sunnah in order to procure their rights; they prefer not going to their own scholars. Ostensibly, they only go to their scholars when they are forced to do by way of threats and warnings of depravation and Jahannam.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/4.

[Hārūn ibn Khārījah says,] I said to Abū ‘Abd Allah عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, “We go to our opponents¹ and we hear such narrations from them which are evidence for us against them.”

He said, “Do not go to them and do not listen to their traditions. May Allah curse them and their polytheist religions.”²

And in *al-Kāfī* the following narration appears on the authority of Sadīr who narrates from Abū Ja‘far:

يا سدير فأريك الصادين عن دين الله ثم نظر إلي أبي حنيفة وسفيان الثوري في ذلك الزمان و هم خلق في المسجد، فقال: هؤلاء الصادون عن دين الله بلا هدي من الله ولا كتاب مبين، إن هؤلاء الأخابث لو جلسوا في بيوتهم فجال الناس، فلم يجدوا أحدا يخبرهم عن الله تبارك و تعالي و عن رسوله صلي الله عليه و آله

“O Sadīr should I not show you the people who have become an obstacle for the dīn of Allah?”

He then looked at Abū Ḥanīfah and Sufyān al-Thawrī who were present in some gatherings in the Masjid and said, “These are the people who prevent others from the dīn of Allah without any guidance from Allah or the Qur’ān. If only these filthy people remained in their homes. The people would then go around and they would not find anyone to tell them about Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and his Rasūl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, hence they would come to us and we would tell them of Allah and his Rasūl.”³

This narration shows that these people became filled with fury when they saw the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah teaching the Qur’ān and the Sunnah to the people, calling them to the dīn of Allah, them being the centre of attraction the dissemination of knowledge; their gatherings would populate the masjid,

1 This is the title they normally use for the Ahl al-Sunnah. It can also include everyone who opposes them.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 2/216. He attributes the narration to *al-Sarā’ir* of Ibn Idrīs.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/392-393; *Tafsīr al-Thaḡalayn* 4/132.

be packed with people and adorned with knowledge. Tranquillity would cover them, mercy would enshroud them, and the angels would surround them. These scholars were the leaders of the pious and their role-models. On the other hand, these haters were confined to their homes. No one would give them attention. Disgrace and neediness had become their hallmark and they became deserving of the anger of the people and their ridicule. Hence they forged these narrations and attributed them to the Ahl al-Bayt in order to mislead their gullible followers and create enmity between the Ahl al-Bayt and the scholars of the Muslims. Their plan was to excommunicate the scholars of the Muslims and empty the land of them so that they would then get the chance to carry out their agenda.

The Islamic Denominations

They have targeted many Muslim denominations with excommunication and revilement, specifically the Ahl al-Sunnah; who they at times call the *Nawāṣib* (enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt) and at times the *Murji'ah* (postponers). In *al-Kāfī* the following narration appears:

عن أبي مسروق قال: سألتني ابو عبد الله عن أهل البصرة ما هم؟ فقلت: مرجئة وقدرية، وحرورية فقال: لعن الله تلك الملل الكافرة المشركة التي لا تعبد الله علي شيء

Abū Masrūq says that Abū ‘Abd Allah asked him regarding the creed of the people of Basrah, to which he responded by saying, “They are *Murji’ah* (the postponers), *Qadariyyah*¹ (the deniers of pre-destiny) and *Ḥarūriyyah* (the faction which rebelled against ‘Alī عليه السلام).”

Thereupon Abū ‘Abd Allah said, “May Allah curse these deviant and polytheist sects which do not worship Allah on the basis of any sound evidence.”²

1 It has passed already that the later generations of the Shī‘ah also denied pre-destiny. Hence this curse encompasses them as well.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/387, 409.

Their intention when using the term Murji'ah is the Ahl al-Sunnah. Hence, al-Majlisī, explaining this narration mentions the following:

اللهم العن المرجئة فهم أعداؤنا في الدنيا والآخرة

O Allah curse the Murji'ah, for they are our enemies in this world and the hereafter.¹

He thereafter explains that the *Irjā'* which is mentioned in the narration refers to postponing the ruling of 'Alī (عليه السلام) to the fourth level.²

It should also be noted that the Zaydiyyah were likewise not spared from the criticism of the Twelvers. Hence a narration which is narrated from 'Umar ibn Yazīd reads as follows:

سألت أبا عبد الله عن الصدقة علي الناصب و علي الزيدية قال: لا تصدق عليهم بشيء ولا تسقيهم من الماء إن استطعت، وقال لي: الزيدية هم النصاب

I asked Abū 'Abd Allah regarding giving charity to the Nawāṣib and the Zaydiyyah, to which he responded saying, "Do not give them charity at all and do not give them any water to drink."

He then said, "The Zaydiyyah are the actual Nawāṣib."³

Another narration in *al-Kāfī* states the following:

عن عبد الله بن المغيرة قال: قلت لأبي الحسن رضي الله عنه: إن لي جارين أحدهما ناصب والآخر زيدي ولا بد من معاشرتهما فمن أعاشر؟ فقال: هما سيان من كذب بآية من كتاب الله فقد نبذ الإسلام وراء ظهره وهو المكذب بجميع القرآن والأنبياء والمرسلين، ثم قال: إن هذا نصب لك، وروى هذا الزيدي نصب لنا

1 *Furū' al-Kāfī* (with the commentary *Mir'āt al-'Uqūl*) 4/371

2 *Mir'āt al-'Uqūl* 4/371.

3 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 199; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 72/179.

[‘Abd Allah ibn al-Mughīrah states,] I asked Abū al-Ḥasan, “I have two neighbours, one is a Nāṣibī and the other is a Zaydī. And I have to interact with either of them, so who should I interact with?”

He said, “They are the same; a person who denies even a verse of the Book of Allah has left the fold of Islam and has belied the entire Qur’ān and all the messengers and prophets.”

He then said, “He (the Nāṣibī) is your opponent and the Zaydī is our opponent.”¹

The fact that the Zaydiyyah promulgated the right of ‘Alī عليه السلام to rule² and were his partisans was not good enough according to the Twelvers because of them also acceding the rule of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar عليه السلام,³ which according to them is a sin that cannot be pardoned. Instead mere love for Abū Bakr عليه السلام according to them is disbelief. In *Bihār al-Anwār* the following narration appears:

عن أبي علي الخرساني عن مولي لعلي بن الحسين عليه السلام قال: كنت معه عليه السلام في بعض خلواته فقلت: إن لي عليك حقاً ألا تخبرني عن هذين الرجلين: عن أبي بكر وعمر؟ فقال: كافران كافرين أحبهما

[Abū ‘Alī al-Khurāsānī narrates from a slave of Abū al-Hasan,] I was with him in privacy and I asked him, “I have a right upon you that you tell me about these two men: Abū Bakr and ‘Umar.”

He said, “They are both disbelievers and whoever loves them is also a disbeliever.”⁴

1 *Al-Kāfī* (with the commentary of al-Māzindarānī): *Kitāb al-Rawḍah* 12/304; *Miftāḥ Kutub al-Arba‘ah* 8/76.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 72/181.

3 *Bihār al-Anwār* 72/181.

4 *Bihār al-Anwār* 72/137-138.

They have likewise considered the mere acknowledgement of the rule of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما to be enmity for the Ahl al-Bayt which according to them is the worst type of disbelief. Al-Majlisī therefore says:

قد يطلق الناصب علي مطلق المخالف غير المستضعف كما هو ظاهر من كثير من الأخبار

The word *Nāṣib* (enemy) is at times used only for a person who is merely an opponent and is not weak, as is obvious from many narrations.¹

He also says:

لا تجوز الصلاة علي المخالف لجبر أو تشبيه أو اعتزال أو خارجية أو أنكار إمامة إلا للتقية، فإن فعل لعنه بعد الرابعة

It is not permissible to read the ṣalāh of a person who opposes *Jabr* (the idea that men do not have freewill), anthropomorphism, rationality, extremism or a person who does not belief in Imāmah, unless he does so by way of Taqiyyah. If he does so (i.e. reads the ṣalāh of such a person by way of Taqiyyah) he should curse him after the fourth Takbīr.²

Al-Mufid has likewise mentioned that all the people of innovation are disbelievers.³ And that is exactly why al-Majlisī established a chapter by the title, *Chapter regarding the Disbelief of the opponents and the Nawāṣib*.⁴

Al-Majlisī further says:

كتب أخبارنا مشحونة بالأخبار الدالة علي كفر الزيدية و أمثالهم من الفطحية، والواقفة

The books of our tradition are filled with narrations which suggest that the Zaydiyyah and their likes, like that of the Faṭḥiyyah and the Wāqifah are disbelievers.⁵

1 *Mir'āt al-'Uqūl* 4/72.

2 *Ibid.* 4/72-73.

3 *Awā'il al-Maqālāt* p. 15.

4 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 72/131.

5 *Ibid.*

The aforementioned sects are all denominations of the Shī'ah themselves. If this is the ruling regarding them then what would the status of the rest besides them be?

We in fact also find that the Twelvers among themselves excommunicate one another. Study what al-Kashshī has narrated, upon which *Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifāh* (the leader of their group) is in agreement with him,¹ regarding their excommunication and bickering among themselves; he mentions that in the year 190 A.H sixteen people convened at the house of Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā. One of them whose name was Ja'far ibn Ṭsā said to him:

يا سيدي نشكوا إلهي الله و إليك ما نحن فيه من أصحابنا، فقال وما أنتم فيه منهم؟ فقال جعفر: هم والله يزندقونا و يكفروننا و يتبرؤون منا، فقال: هكذا كان أصحاب علي بن الحسين، و محمد بن علي ، وأصحاب جعفر و موسى: صلوات الله عليهم و لقد كان أصحاب زراداة يكفرون غيرهم، و كذلك غيرهم كانوا يكفرونهم... وقال يونس: جعلت فداك إنهم يزعمون أنا زنادقة

Ja'far said, "O my master I complain to Allah and to you² regarding the state of our companions."

He asked, "What is the matter?"

Ja'far said, "They call us heretics, excommunicate us, and disassociate themselves from us."

He replied, "This was the condition of the followers of 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, Muḥammad ibn 'Alī, Ja'far, and Mūsā—may the peace of Allah descend upon them. Likewise the students of Zurārah would also excommunicate others, just as the others would excommunicate them as well..."

And Yūnus said, "They claim that we are heretics."³

1 Because he refined *Rijāl al-Kashshī* and chose to work on it.

2 To phrase the sentence in this way is prohibited due to its polytheistic implication. It should rather be said, "We complain to Allah first and then to you." But the deviance of the Shī'ah is way beyond this one point. However, I mentioned this for the benefit of the reader.

3 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* 498-499.

This is the condition of the first generation among them who would falsely fabricate lies and attribute them to the Ahl al-Bayt. One can well imagine what the condition of those who succeeded them would be.

The Entire Ummah

Cursing the Ummah and excommunicating it in its entirety is something very commonly found in the books of the Shī'ah. That is why all the prayers that the Shī'ah offer and often repeat at the tombs and holy sites are filled with curses upon this blessed Ummah whose hallmark is moderation.

Hence when visiting the grave of Amīr al-Mu'minīn they supplicate thus:

لعن الله من خالفك و لعن الله من افتري عليك و ظلمك، و لعن الله من غصبك، و لعن الله من بلغه ذلك فرضي به، أنا إلي الله منهم بري، لعن الله أمة خالفتك و أمة جحدتك، و جحدت ولايتك، و أمة تظاهرت عليك، و أمة حادت عنك و خذلتك، اللهم العن الجوايبت و الطواغيت و الفراعنة، واللات و العزي، و كل ند يدعي دون الله، و كل مفتر، اللهم و أشياعهم و أتباعهم، و أولياءهم، و أعوانهم، و محبيهم لعنا كثيرا

May Allah curse the one who opposed you. May he curse the one who forged lies against you and oppressed you. May he curse the one who usurped your right.¹ And may he curse the one who received the news of this and was fine with it.² I disassociate myself from them before Allah. May Allah curse the Ummah which opposed you,³ the Ummah which belied you and your rulership,⁴ the Ummah which collaborated against you, the

1 Oppression and usurpation according to them is the rulership of Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān. (See: *Al-I'tiqādāt* p. 112-113).

2 I.e. was happy with the rulership of Abū Bakr. Because according to them it was based on oppression and usurpation. In this way this curse includes the entire Ummah with the exception of the extremist Shī'ah of course.

3 By appointing Abū Bakr.

4 The Wilāyah of 'Alī starts from the time of the demise of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. Hence whoever concedes the rulership of the first three Khulafā' according to them denies the rulership of 'Alī. (See: *Al-Irshād* p. 13)

Ummah which abandoned and forsook you. All praise belongs to Allah who has made hell-fire their final abode; indeed a very bad abode and indeed bad will be its incumbents... O Allah curse the devils, the idols, and the pharaohs, Lāt and ‘Uzzā, any equal who is worshiped besides Allah,¹ and every liar. O Allah curse them, their partisans, their followers, their allies, their helpers, and their lovers; excessively.²

These curses which incessantly flow from the tongues of these people instead of the glorification of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and his praises have their effect in filling their hearts with malice and hatred for the Ummah and its dīn.

Furthermore, the Twelvers have accorded such despicable titles to the Ummah which are not found in the books of any other denomination besides them. Not for any other reason, but because the Ummah was happy with those whom the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār chose as their rulers.

Hence at times they accuse the entire Ummah of debauchery.³ At times they claim that the entire Ummah is the illegitimate children of adultery⁴ owing to which they will be called with the names of their mothers on the Day of Judgement.⁵ And at times they claim that all the individuals of the Ummah are disfigured,

1 From *Jawābīt*, onwards, according to them these terms refer to the Muslim rulers, especially the first three rulers, and the Umayyad rulers. And the equal who is worshipped besides Allah is an Imām or leader who people give their allegiance to other than the Twelve Imāms. (Refer back to their belief regarding the oneness of Allah in terms of him being the deity who is worthy of worship).

2 *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faḳīh* 2/354.

3 They say that at the birth of every child a devil comes to him in order to incite him to do evil. And no one besides the Shī‘ah according to them is safe from this. Their narrations and citations in this regard have passed on p. 626 footnote 2 of this book.

4 They say that the entire Ummah besides the Shī‘ah are the children of prostitutes. This has likewise passed already... See p. 626 footnote 2 of this book

5 This is one of the Chapters of *Biḥār al-Anwār* 7/237.

they are not humans, rather they are monkeys and pigs.¹ And the list of curses and accusations goes on...

It is clear from the details that have passed that the Shī'ah have not spared anybody of this Ummah from their criticism and excommunication. They have specifically targeted the companions of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, the Muhājirīn and Anṣār, the household of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, the Muslim metropolises and their inhabitants, the Islamic denominations and the entire Ummah at large. They curse all the aforementioned categories in their supplications, prayers and when visiting their holy sites. Have they excluded anybody? Yes they have excluded the following group and have supported them and praised them...

1 One such example is the following narration which is narrated from Abū Baṣīr, "I asked Abū Ja'far thus, "I am your supporter and your friend. And I have weak vision, so can you promise me Jannah?" He said, "Should I not show a sign of the truthfulness of the Imāms?"

I said, "You will not suffer any loss if you have to do so."

He thus said, "Do you really want to see it?"

I said, "Why not?"

Hence he rubbed his hand over my eyes and suddenly I was able to see the entire orchard wherein he was sitting.

He then said, "O Abū Muḥammad! This is your vision, so see what you can see."

I thus looked around and I could not see anything besides dogs, pigs, and monkeys, so I asked, "What is this disfigured creation?"

He said, "This is the majority of this Ummah. If the veils were raised, the Shī'ah would not see the people who oppose them in any other condition besides this condition."

He then asked, "O Abū Muḥammad! If you want I can leave you as you are and Allah will take you to task. And if you want I can guarantee you Jannah and change your condition to what it was previously."

I told him, "I have no need to see this disfigured creation. Reinstate my previous condition, for Jannah is invaluable."

He thus rubbed his hand on my eye and I became as I was. (*Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/30. He has sourced the narration from *al-Kharā'ij wa al-Jarā'iḥ* of *al-Rāwandī*).

The group which the Shī'ah Exclude from their Blanket Excommunication and Curses

After excommunicating the Ṣaḥābah, the Ahl al-Bayt, the rulers, the judges, the scholars, and all the denominations—which include some Shī'ī denominations as well—it would be interesting to see who they exclude.

In my readings of their literature I have found that they extol the scum of this Ummah and the worst of humans. In fact I have found that they praise and support outright disbelievers, hypocrites, and heretics (after all the souls are all categorised into clusters. Those among them who recognise each other tend to bond with one another).

Therefore we see that the Shī'ah defend the integrity of renegades like Musaylamah the liar,¹ heretics like Mukhtār ibn Abī 'Ubayd² and Naṣīr al-Ṭūsī,³ liars like Jābir al-Ju'fī⁴ and Zurārah ibn A'yan,⁵ and fire worshippers who were the ardent enemies of Islām like Abū Lu'lu' al-Majūsī—the murderer of 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb—whom they title *Bābā Shujā' al-Dīn* (the brave hero of dīn).⁶

Similarly, they have received their legacy from disbelievers who believed in the interpolation of the Qur'ān and considered the companions of Rasūl Allah

1 See: 'Abd Allah al-'Alāyilī: *al-Imām al-Ḥusain* (the preface of the second edition) p. 3, 4, 19; *al-Muntaqā* p. 271-273.

2 Ibn Idrīs: *al-Sarā'ir* p. 475; Ḥusayn al-Barqī: *Tārīkh al-Kūfah* p. 62.

3 Al-Khawānsārī: *Rawdāt al-Jannāt* 6/300-301; al-Khumainī: *al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 128.

4 See p. 506 of this book.

5 See p. 511 of this book.

6 'Abbās al-Qummi: *al-Kunā wa al-Alqāb* 2/55. The day of the assassination of 'Umar رضي الله عنه is considered a day of great celebration according to them. Hence they say, "This is a day of celebration and it is one of our best celebrations." (See: al-Jazā'irī: *Al-Anwār al-Nu'māniyyah*: Chapter regarding a divine light which reveals the reward for the day 'Umar was killed: 1/108, onwards. This the belief they hold regarding one of the giants of Islam. The reason why they harbour this malice against 'Umar رضي الله عنه is that he was the one who conquered the lands of Persia and annexed them to the Muslim empire. Therefore, they respect his killer and celebrate the day of his murder.

صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to be renegades and disbelievers, like that of Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, al-Kulaynī and their likes whom they consider reliable transmitters of their dīn and the cornerstone of their legacy.

Analyses

Does this stance, the blanket excommunication of the entire Ummah without any exception, require any analyses? Its invalidity is so obvious that it does not have to be mentioned, and its falsity is so apparent that it does not have to be highlighted. In essence, the excommunication of the Ummah is an extension of the excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ; the reason is the same in both cases.

A person who hates the Companions of Rasūl Allāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, reviles them, and excommunicates them will naturally hate the Ummah and excommunicate it as well, as is mentioned by one of the pious predecessors:

لا يغل قلب أحد علي أحد من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلا كان قلبه علي المسلمين
أغل

No person's heart will be filled with rancour for the Ṣaḥābah except that his heart will be filled with more rancour for the Muslims in general.¹

Can a person who is not pleased with Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān, the veterans of Badr, the participants of the pledge of Ridwān, the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār, who had attained the highest levels of piety and virtue; ever be pleased with anyone after them?

The basis of this stance is the claim of the Shī'ah that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ rejected the emphatic nomination of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and pledged their allegiance to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. The refutation of this baseless claim in light of the Qur'ān, the Sunnah,

¹ Ibn Baṭṭāh: *al-Ibānah* p. 41.

reason, and the categorical aspects of dīn has passed already. And whatever is based upon a baseless precept is baseless itself.

The mere fact that the Shī'ah excommunicate the unique generation which is extolled in the Qur'ān is enough evidence of the falsehood of their dogma and of the fact that its very basis was laid down by a group of heretics. The invalidity of this stance of theirs is very clear. Aḥmad al-Kisrawī, an Iranian and a Shī'ī by origin, therefore, mentions the following:

و أما ما قالوا من ارتداد المسلمين بعد موت النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فاجترأ منهم علي الكذب و
البهتان، فلقاتل أن يقول: كيف ارتدوا و هم كانوا أصحاب النبي آمنوا به حين كذبه الآخرون، و دافعوا عنه
واحتملوا الأذى في سبيله ثم ناصروه في حروبه، ولم يرغبوا عنه بأنفسهم، ثم أي نفع لهم في خلافة ابي
بكر ليرتدوا عن دينهم لأجله؟! فأأي الأمرين أسهل احتمالا: أكذب رجلا أو رجلين من ذوي الأغراض
الفاسدة أو ارتداد بضع مآت من خلص المسلمين؟ فأجيبونا إن كان لكم جواب

As for their claim that the Muslims turned renegade after the demise of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, it stems from their boldness in speaking lies and casting allegations. For it is possible for someone to say: Why would they turn renegade when they were the Companions of Rasūl Allah ﷺ who embraced his faith when others rejected it, who defended him and underwent difficulties in supporting his cause, who stood by his side in all his battles and who did not give preference to themselves over him. What benefit really was there for them in the rulership of Abū Bakr due to which they were willing to leave the fold of Islam? Which of the two are more likely: I belie one or two people who had ulterior motives or the apostasy of a few hundred Muslims? Give us an answer if you have any.¹

Nonetheless, even though their dogma rests on no solid grounding, due to it being contrary to Sharī'ah, reason, history, and those aspects which are categorically considered to be part of Islam, it is still necessary for us to halt here—even for a little while—to refute it. Because there were many people in the past and there are many people currently who are unaware of the proofs in this regard. It is sufficient for you to know that one of their contemporary scholars, Muḥammad

1 *Al-Shī'ah wa al-Tashayyu'* p. 66.

al-Khālīṣī, who is known for advocating the slogans of unity of the Ummah and continuously highlighting them in his publications, speeches, and journeys;¹ wrote the following letter to Shaykh Muḥammad Bahjah al-Bayṭār on the 26th of Rabīʿ al-Awwal 1382 A.H. It reads as follows:

لم أذكر الصحابة بخير لأني لا أريد أن أعرض لعذاب الله و سخطه بمخالفتي كتابه و سنته في مدح من
 ذمه الكتاب و السنة، و الإطراء علي من قبح أعماله القرآن المجيد، والأحاديث المتواتر عن النبي صلي
 الله عليه وسلم و غاية ما كنت أكتبه و أقوله هو أن كتاب الله و سنته لم تذكر الصحابة بخير ولا تدل علي
 فضل لهم لأنهم صحابة

I have not mentioned the Ṣaḥābah in good light because I do not want to become a victim of the punishment of Allah ﷻ and his displeasure by going against His Book and the Sunnah in praising those whom they both have condemned, and in extolling those whose actions have been condemned in the Qur’ān and the widespread traditions of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. All I can say is that the Qur’ān and the Sunnah have not highlighted the Ṣaḥābah positively. And the fact that they were Ṣaḥābah is not sufficient to prove their virtue.²

As you have noticed, al-Khālīṣī does not wish to speak favourably of the Ṣaḥābah despite the fact that their virtue is very well established in the holy texts. Conversely, he asserts regarding the Twelve Imāms that they are the pillars of īmān and that Allah will not accept the actions of men but after their allegiance to them.³ Whereas in the Qur’ān there features no mention whatsoever of the Twelve Imāms, nor their respective rulerships. Notice how they belie clear-cut realities and how they believe in outright lies. If this is the case, then it is our duty to refute their claims and establish the virtue of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ in light of the Qur’ān, the Sunnah, the verdicts of the Imāms, history, reason and the categorically established aspects of Dīn. In doing so, we will also expose the person who invented this belief and introduced it to the Shīʿī dogma.

1 See, for example, *al-Islām Fawq Kull Shay’* p. 65.

2 Muḥammad Bahjah al-Bayṭār: *Risālah al-Islām wa al-Ṣaḥābah al-Kirām Bayn al-Sunnah wa al-Shīʿah* p. 6.

3 Al-Khālīṣī: *al-I’tiṣām bi Ḥabl Allah* p. 42.

This will simultaneously serve as a refutation of their excommunication of the rest of the Ummah, because they excommunicate the Ummah for the very same reason that they excommunicate the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. The only difference is that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were attacked more than the others by the Shī'ah with the sole purpose of invalidating the Sharī'ah which they transmitted.

The Qur'ān

The verses of the Qur'ān bear testimony to the fact that the Ṣaḥābah were people of upstanding character and that Allah ﷻ was pleased with them and praised them in many emphatic and clear verses. We do not require any esoteric interpretations to realise this, as is the method of the Twelvers in interpreting the verses of the Qur'ān.

Allah ﷻ says:

كُنْتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ

You are the best nation which has been taken out for the benefit of people.¹

It is sufficient an honour for them that Allah ﷻ has addressed by the “the best of people,” for they were most certainly the first addressees of this verse. And there can be no status loftier than the status of a people whom Allah ﷻ chose for the company of his beloved and his support.²

The Salaf have interpreted this verse in various ways all of which eventually conclude that this verse was revealed regarding the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. Allah ﷻ told them that they are the best of people.³

1 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 110.

2 Ibn Ḥajr al-Haythamī: *al-Ṣawā'iq al-Muḥriqah* p. 7

3 Ibn 'Aṭiyyah: *al-Muḥarrar al-Wajīz*: 3/193. Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Wazīr, one of the senior scholars of the Zaydiyyah, mentions the following after shedding some light on the lives of these illustrious companions the likes of who no nation on earth has ever seen before: “These feats caution an unwary person and they increase the insight of an intelligent person. Otherwise the verse, ‘**You are the best of nations**’ is sufficient a proof of their virtue. (*Al-Rawḍ al-Bāsim* 1/56-57. See also: Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb: *al-Jīl al-Thānī* p. 19.

Likewise Allah ﷻ says:

وَالسَّابِقُونَ السَّابِقُونَ مِنَ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ وَالْأَنْصَارِ وَالَّذِينَ اتَّبَعُوهُمْ بِإِحْسَانٍ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ وَأَعَدَّ لَهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا ذَلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ

And the first forerunners [in the faith] among the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār and those who followed them with good conduct — Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him, and He has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide forever. That is the great attainment.¹

This verse very clearly states that Allah ﷻ was pleased with the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār, and those who followed them meticulously. It promises them great success and everlasting bliss in Jannah. Ibn Kathīr رحمه الله therefore says:

فيا ويل من أبغضهم أو سبهم، أو أبغض أو سب بعضهم ولا سيما سيد الصحابة بعد الرسول و خيرهم و أفضلهم أعني الصديق الأكبر و الخليفة الأعظم أبا بكر بن أبي قحافة رضي الله عنه، فإن طائفة المخذولة من الرافضة يعادون أفضل الصحابة ويبغضونهم ويسبونهم عياذا بالله من ذلك. وهذا يدل علي أن عقولهم معكوسة وقلوبهم منكوسة. فأين هؤلاء من الإيمان بالقرآن إذ يسبون من رضي الله عنهم.

So woe be to the one who hates them and reviles them, or hates and reviles some of them, especially the leader of the Ṣaḥābah, the best among them, and the most virtuous after Rasūl Allah ﷺ, i.e. al-Ṣiddīq the great successor. The Shī'ah harbour enmity against the best among the Ṣaḥābah, they oppose them and revile them.² May Allah save us from that. This is evidence of the fact that their intelligence is reversed and their hearts are inverted. Can they possibly have any faith in the Qur'ān if they revile the Ṣaḥābah رحمه الله؟³

Allah ﷻ also says:

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 100.

2 Instead they have taken it a step ahead and have dubbed them disbelievers and renegades.

3 Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 2/410.

لَقَدْ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ إِذْ يُبَايِعُونَكَ تَحْتَ الشَّجَرَةِ فَعَلِمَ مَا فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ فَأَنْزَلَ السَّكِينَةَ عَلَيْهِمْ
وَأَتَانَهُمْ فَتْحًا قَرِيبًا

Certainly was Allah pleased with the believers when they pledged allegiance to you, [O Muhammad], under the tree, and He knew what was in their hearts, so He sent down tranquillity upon them and rewarded them with an imminent conquest.¹

Ibn Ḥazm says:

فمن أخبرنا الله سبحانه أنه علم ما في قلوبهم، و رضي عنهم، و أنزل السكينة عليهم فلا يحل لأحد
التوقف في أمرهم ولا الشك فيهم البتة

Allah ﷻ is informing us that he knew what is in their hearts, he was pleased with them and that he send down tranquillity upon them. Hence, after this it is not permissible for any person to remain hesitant in their matter and doubt their integrity.²

Those who pledged their allegiance to Rasūl Allah ﷺ under the tree at the mountain of Tan'im,³ were in total more than 1400 Ṣaḥābah. They pledged their allegiance to him when the polytheists barred him from performing 'Umrah.⁴

These were the very same people, as Ibn Taymiyah mentions, who pledged allegiance to Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.⁵

A person who denies the proclamation of his Lord that He was pleased with those who pledged their allegiance under the tree is indeed a loser. Any person who

1 Al-Faḥḥ: 18

2 Al-Faṣḥ: 4/225.

3 The mountain of Tan'im is situated at a distance of three to four miles from Makkah. This name was given because on its right is the Nu'aym and on its left is the Nā'im Mountains. And the valley's name is Na'mān.

4 *Minḥāj al-Sunnah* (the revised version of Rashād Sālim) 2/15-16.

5 Ibid. 1/206.

has a little knowledge knows without any doubt that Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān, ‘Alī, Ṭalḥah, Zubayr, ‘Ammār, and Mughīrah ibn Shu‘bah were all part of this glad-tiding. The Khawārij and the Shī‘ah on the other hand have obstinately disassociated themselves from them, opposing Allah ﷻ.¹

Allah ﷻ likewise says:

مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ مَعَهُ أَشِدَّاءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَاءُ بَيْنَهُمْ تَرَاهُمْ رُكَّعًا سُجَّدًا يَبْتَغُونَ فَضْلًا
مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَرِضْوَانًا سِيمَاهُمْ فِي وُجُوهِهِمْ مِّنْ أَثَرِ السُّجُودِ ذَلِكَ مَثَلُهُمْ فِي التَّوْرَةِ وَمَثَلُهُمْ فِي
الْإِنْجِيلِ كَزَرْعٍ أَخْرَجَ شَطْأَهُ فَآزَرَهُ فَاسْتَغْلَظَ فَاسْتَوَىٰ عَلَىٰ سُوقِهِ يُعْجِبُ الزُّرَّاعَ لِيَغِظَ بِهِمُ الْكُفَّارَ
وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ مِنْهُمْ مَغْفِرَةً وَأَجْرًا عَظِيمًا

Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah; and those with him are forceful against the disbelievers, merciful among themselves. You see them bowing and prostrating [in prayer], seeking bounty from Allah and [His] pleasure. Their mark [i.e. sign] is on their faces [i.e. foreheads] from the trace of prostration. That is their description in the Torah. And their description in the Gospel is as a plant which produces its offshoots and strengthens them so they grow firm and stand upon their stalks, delighting the sowers so that He may enrage by them the disbelievers. Allah has promised those who believe and do righteous deeds among them forgiveness and a great reward.²

Ponder over the great status of the Ṣaḥābah, for Allah ﷻ has praised them with these great qualities and has informed us that they are described in this manner in the Torah and the Injīl. Some scholars are of the opinion that the purport of this verse implies that the Shī‘ah are disbelievers. Because they harbour enmity for the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and Allah ﷻ in the verse mentions, **“So that He may enrage by them the disbelievers.”** Hence the conclusion is that whoever harbours enmity for them is from the disbelievers.³

1 Al-Faṣl 4/226.

2 Sūrah al-Faṭḥ: 29

3 Al-Asfarā‘īnī: al-Tabṣīr fī al-Dīn p. 25; Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 4/219; Tafsīr al-Qasīmī 15/104.

Furthermore, Allah ﷻ says:

لَا يَسْتَوِي مِنْكُمْ مَنْ أَنْفَقَ مِنْ قَبْلِ الْفَتْحِ وَقَاتَلَ أُولَئِكَ أَعْظَمُ دَرَجَةً مَنِ الَّذِينَ أَنْفَقُوا مِنْ بَعْدِ وَقَاتَلُوا وَكَلَّا وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الْحُسْنَىٰ

Not equal among you are those who spent before the conquest [of Makkah] and fought [and those who did so after it]. Those are greater in degree than they who spent afterwards and fought. But to all God has promised *Husnā*, the best [reward].¹

And Allah ﷻ mentions the following regarding all those whom he has promised *Husnā*:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ سَبَقَتْ لَهُمْ مِنَّا الْحُسْنَىٰ أُولَئِكَ عَنْهَا مُبْعَدُونَ لَا يَسْمَعُونَ حَسِيسَهَا وَهُمْ فِي مَا اشْتَهَتْ أَنْفُسُهُمْ خَالِدُونَ. لَا يَحْزَنُهُمُ الْفَزَعُ الْأَكْبَرُ

Indeed, those for whom *Husnā*, the best [reward] has preceded from us – they are from it far removed. They will not hear its sound, while they are, in that which their souls desire, abiding eternally. They will not be grieved by the greatest terror.²

Understanding both these verses comprehensively proves that Allah ﷻ has promised *Husnā* for anyone who accompanied Nabī ﷺ. And Allah ﷻ says that he does not go against his promises.³ Likewise Allah ﷻ clearly mentions that any person who has been promised *Husnā* will be kept so far from the fire of Jahannam that he will not even hear its sound, he will remain forever in Jannah fulfilling all his desires and the horror of the great day will not grieve him. And the hypocrites and disbelievers are not from the Companions of Rasūl Allah ﷺ.⁴

Allah ﷻ also says:

1 Sūrah al-Ḥadīd: 10

2 Sūrah al-Ambiyā': 101, 102, 103.

3 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 9.

4 Al-Muḥallā 1/42.

لِلْفُقَرَاءِ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ الَّذِينَ أُخْرِجُوا مِنْ دِيَارِهِمْ وَأَمْوَالِهِمْ يَبْتَغُونَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَرِضْوَانًا وَيَبْصُرُونَ
 اللَّهُ وَرَسُولَهُ أُولَئِكَ هُمُ الصَّادِقُونَ وَالَّذِينَ تَبَوَّءُوا الدَّارَ وَالْإِيمَانَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ يُحِبُّونَ مَنْ هَاجَرَ إِلَيْهِمْ
 وَلَا يَجِدُونَ فِي صُدُورِهِمْ حَاجَةً مِّمَّا أُوتُوا وَيُؤْثِرُونَ عَلَىٰ أَنْفُسِهِمْ وَلَوْ كَانَ بِهِمْ خَصَاصَةٌ وَمَنْ
 يُوقِ شُحَّ نَفْسِهِ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ وَالَّذِينَ جَاءُوا مِنْ بَعْدِهِمْ يَقُولُونَ رَبَّنَا اغْفِرْ لَنَا وَلِإِخْوَانِنَا
 الَّذِينَ سَبَقُونَا بِالْإِيمَانِ وَلَا تَجْعَلْ فِي قُلُوبِنَا غِلًّا لِلَّذِينَ آمَنُوا رَبَّنَا إِنَّكَ رَءُوفٌ رَحِيمٌ

For the poor emigrants who were expelled from their homes and their properties, seeking bounty from Allah and [His] approval and supporting Allah and His Messenger, [there is also a share]. Those are the truthful. And [also for] those who were settled in the Home [i.e. al-Madīnah] and [adopted] the faith before them. They love those who emigrated to them and find not any want in their breasts of what they [i.e. the emigrants] were given but give [them] preference over themselves, even though they are in privation. And whoever is protected from the stinginess of his soul – it is those who will be the successful. And [there is a share for] those who came after them, saying, “Our Lord, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith and put not in our hearts [any] resentment toward those who have believed. Our Lord, indeed you are Kind and Merciful.”¹

This verse comprises of praises for the Muhājirīn, the Anṣār, and those who succeed them and seek forgiveness for them; asking Allah ﷻ to create no resentment in their hearts for them. It also mentions that these three categories are the people who are deserving of Fay'.² It goes without doubt that the Shī'ah are not part of any of these three categories. Because they do not seek forgiveness for the predecessors, rather they harbour enmity against them. In essence, the verse praises the Ṣaḥābah and the Ahl al-Sunnah who befriend them, and it necessarily excludes the Shī'ah. This itself is enough to debunk the Shī'ī dogma.³

There are many more verses related to this topic, but have sufficed with the boave in proving our point.

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 8, 9, 10.

2 Booty acquired without battle.

3 Minhāj al-Sunnah 1/204.

The Pristine Sunnah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ

The books of Sunnah are filled with the praises of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and the mention of their merits by Rasūl Allah ﷺ.

Some narrations praise the entire fraternity of Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. For example the narration:

لا تسبوا أصحابي، لا تسبوا أصحابي، فوالذي نفسي بيده لو أن أحدكم أنفق مثل أحد ذهباً ما أدرك مد أحدهم ولا نصيفه

Do not revile my Companions, do not revile my Companions. For By Allah, if any of you were to spend gold equivalent to the mountain of Uḥud as charity it would not equate to the *Mudd*¹ of any of them or even half its amount.²

And the narration:

خير الناس قرني، ثم الذين يلونهم، ثم الذين يلونهم، قال عمران: فلا أدري أذكر بعد قرنه قرنين أو ثلاثة

The best of people are the people of my generation, then those who succeed them, and then those who succeed them.

‘Imrān says, “I do not know whether he made mention of two generations after his or three.”³

1 A special measurement used in those days.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: Chapter regarding the merits of the Ṣaḥābah of Nabī ﷺ: 4/195; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: Chapter regarding the merits of the Ṣaḥābah: Sub-chapter regarding the impermissibility of reviling the Ṣaḥābah: 2/1967; *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*: Chapter regarding Sunnah: Sub-chapter regarding the prohibition of swearing the Ṣaḥābah of Nabī ﷺ: 5/45; *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*: Chapter of Merits: Sub-chapter no. 59: 5/695-696.

3 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: Chapter regarding testimonies: Sub-chapter regarding not falsely testifying...: 3/151; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: Chapter regarding the merits of the Ṣaḥābah: Sub-Chapter regarding the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah and those who succeeded them, and those who succeeded them: 2/1962 (with similar wording).

Some narrations extoll the virtues of specific groups among them. For example Rasūl Allah ﷺ said the following regarding the participants of Badr:

وما يدريك لعل الله اطلع علي أهل بدر فقال: اعملوا ما شئتم فقد غفرت لكم

And don't you know that Allah ﷻ gazed at the people of Badr and said,
“Do what you want for I have forgiven you.”¹

Likewise the narrations which comprise of the merits of the participants of the pledge of Riqdān. Rasūl Allah ﷺ said:

لا يدخل النار من أصحاب الشجرة أحد، الذين بايعوا تحتها

None of those who pledged allegiance beneath the tree will enter hell-fire.²

Whilst there are other narrations which specifically extoll the virtues of individuals amongst the Ṣaḥābah. They are numerous and are documented in the *Ṣiḥāḥ*, *Sunan*, and the *Masānīd*.³

However, the Shī'ah have opted to distance themselves from this vast resource of knowledge. For they do not draw evidence from it. Hence, it is meaningless for us to marshal evidence from our narrations against them because they will not accept them. Likewise, it is meaningless for them to marshal evidence against us from their legacy because we will not accept it. Hence it will only be appropriate

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: Chapter regarding the merits of the Ṣaḥābah: Sub-chapter regarding the virtue of the people of Badr: 2/1941.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: Chapter regarding the merits of the Ṣaḥābah: Sub-chapter regarding the virtue of the people of the tree: 2/1942.

3 Refer to *Jāmi' al-Uṣūl*: the fourth chapter regarding the merits and virtues of Ṣaḥābah ﷺ. Therein there are five chapters: 8/547, onwards; Imām Aḥmad: *Faḍā'il al-Ṣaḥābah*; al-Nasā'ī: *Faḍā'il al-Ṣaḥābah*; al-Shawkānī: *Durr al-Ṣaḥābah fī Manāqib al-Qarābah wa al-Ṣaḥābah*; al-Kaysī: *Ṣaḥābah Rasūl Allah ﷺ fī al-Kitāb wa al-Sunnah* p. 161.

for each of the parties to furnish such evidence which the opposite party will be willing to accept and concede, whether the furnishing party believes in its validity or not.¹

I have therefore sufficed at this juncture on referring to the seminal works of Sunnah which contain the merits of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. For in them is contained a vast amount of traditions regarding the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, their praise, and the impermissibility of reviling them. Subsequently, I shall try to establish inculpatory evidence against them from their books and from the narrations of their Imāms which they treat as equal to the traditions of Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم.

The Commendation of the Ṣaḥābah by the Imāms

In his *al-Khiṣāl* Ibn Bābawayh has cited the following narration:

كان أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم اثني عشر ألفاً، ثمانية آلاف من المدينة وألفان من أهل مكة، وألفان من الطلقاء لم ير فيهم قدري، ولا مرجي، ولا حروري، ولا معتزلي، ولا صاحب رأي كانوا يكون الليل والنهار

The Companions of Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم were twelve thousand in total,² eight thousand belonged to Madīnah, two thousand belonged to Makkah, and

1 *Al-Faṣl* 4/159.

2 This is a fabrication of ignorant people. Because the amount of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم who participated with Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم in the Battle of Ḥunayn itself was twelve thousand, and that also was without those who tagged along by the way and the women. Thereafter the people of Hawāzin came to him and embraced Islām. And Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم had left Makkah filled with people. Very similar to this was the case of Madīnah. Similarly all the tribes that he passed had accepted Islam. All of the aforementioned were thus Muslims. Subsequent to that, in the Battle of Tabūk so many people were with him that a register could not encompass them. The crowds were similar in his farewell Ḥajj as well. And all these people without doubt were honoured with *Ṣuḥbah* (his companionship) (see: Ibn al-Athīr: *Uṣd al-Ghābah* 1/12). Abū Zur‘ah asserts that Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم passed away and the amount of people who saw him and heard from him were more than a hundred thousand, males and females. (See: *Taqrīb al-Rāwī* 2/221; *al-Iṣābah* p. 4; al-Dhahabī: *Tajrīd Asmā’ al-Ṣaḥābah* P. ب. The most reliable stance in this regard is that their accurate amount is not known. (See: *Faṭḥ al-Mughīth* 3/111).

two thousand were those who were released (at the Conquest of Makkah). Not one amongst them was known to be a *Qadarī* (denier of pre-destiny), a *Murji'* (postponer), a *Ḥarūrī* (an extremist), a *Mu'tazilī* (rationalist) and a follower of his own views. They were people who cried day and night.¹

And in *Biḥār al-Anwār* the following narration is narrated from al-Ṣādiq who narrates it from his forefathers who narrate it from 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ:

أوصيكم بأصحاب نبيكم لا تسبهم الذين لم يحدثوا بعده حدثا و لم يؤوا محدثا، فإن رسول الله صلي الله عليه بهم الخير

I emphasise upon you regarding the Companions of your Nabī. Do not revile them. For indeed they did not bring about innovations into the dīn after him, nor did they give amnesty to an innovator. Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ also bequeathed that they should be treated amiably.²

The following narration also appears in *Biḥār al-Anwār*:

طوبى لمن رآني، و طوبى لمن رأى من رآني، و طوبى لمن رأى من رأى من رآني

Fortunate is the person who saw me. Fortunate is the person who saw the person who saw me. And fortunate is the person who saw the one who saw the one who saw me.³

Their seventh Imām, Mūsā ibn Ja'far, narrates that Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said:

أنا أمانة لأصحابي، فإذا قبضت دنا من أصحابي ما يوعدون، و أصحابي أمانة لأمتي، فإذا قبض أصحابي دنا من أمتي ما يوعدون ولا يزال هذا الذين ظاهرا علي الأديان كلها ما دام فيهم من قد رآني

I am a source of security for my companions; when I pass away that which my Companions are promised will come their way. My Companions are

1 Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī: *al-Khiṣāl* p. 639-640. See also: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/305.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/305, 306.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/305; *Amālī al-Ṣadūq* p. 240-241.

likewise a source of security for my Ummah; when they are taken away that which the Ummah is promised will come their way. As long as there remains amongst you one person who saw me, this dīn will reign supreme over all other religions.¹

Similarly, Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī has narrated the following in his book *Ma'ānī al-Aḥbār*:

عن جعفر بن محمد عن آبائه عليهم السلام قال: قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: ما وجدتم في كتاب الله عز وجل فالعمل لكم به لا عذر لكم في تركه، وما لم يكن في كتاب الله عز وجل، وكانت فيه سنة مني فلا عذر لكم في ترك سنتي، وما لم يكن فيه سنة مني فما قال أصحابي فقولوا به، وإنما مثل أصحابي فيكم كمثال النجوم بأبها أخذ اهتدي، وبأي أفاويل أصحابي أخذتم اهتديتم (ثم زاد دعاة التفرقة علي هذا النص الزيادة التالية) فقل يا رسول الله ومن أصحابك؟ قال: أهل بيتي

Ja'far ibn Muḥammad narrates from his forefathers that Rasūl Allāh ﷺ said, “Whatever you find in the Book of Allah, practicing it is your duty; you have no excuse to abandon it. And that which you do not find in the Book of Allah and find in my Sunnah, you have no excuse not to practice upon it. And in aspects for which you do not find guidance in my Sunnah, follow that which my Companions say. For my Companions are like the stars, whichever one you will follow you will attain guidance; likewise whichever of the views of my Companions you will follow you will attain guidance. (The portion which follows is of course the addition of those who desire to disunite the Ummah). It was then asked, “Who are your companions oh Rasūl Allāh?” He said, “My Household.”²

It is very clear that interpreting “Companions” as “Household” is completely far-fetched. Their scholar al-Ṣadūq realised the far-fetched nature of this interpretation and therefore commented:

إن أهل البيت لا يختلفون، ولكن يفتون الشيعة بمر الحق، وربما أفتوهم بالتقية فما يختلف من قولهم فهو للتقية والتقية رحمة للشيعة

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/309-310 (with reference to: *Nawādir al-Rāwandī* p. 23).

2 *Ma'ānī al-Aḥbār* p. 156- 157; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 22/307.

The Ahl al-Bayt do not have differences amongst themselves, rather they always tell the Shī'ah to follow the truth even if it be bitter. And at times they order them to practice Taqiyyah. Hence those statements which are contrary to their usual statements are based on Taqiyyah and Taqiyyah is a mercy for the Shī'ah.¹

In this comment he concludes that the commendation of the Ṣaḥābah was based on Taqiyyah. Whereas logic and reason reject this interpretation completely. For how can praising the Ṣaḥābah whom Allah ﷻ and his Rasūl ﷺ praised and to whose merits and efforts history has attested, be by way of Taqiyyah? And how can reviling them be based on reality and the stance of the Imāms? They have no evidence for this besides the fact that it resonates well with the enemies of the Ummah.

Furthermore, the aforementioned text is narrated by Ja'far al-Ṣādiq from Rasūl Allah ﷺ. So is it possible to aver that Rasūl Allah ﷺ, out of Taqiyyah, spoke a lie to the Ummah, or that Ja'far fabricated a lie and attributed it Rasūl Allah ﷺ. Whichever of the two is asserted, it is an indictment to Rasūl Allah ﷺ and the Ahl al-Bayt and a clear rejection of the texts.

Nonetheless, in *Nahj al-Balāghah* 'Alī رضي الله عنه is reported to have made the following remarks regarding Abū Bakr or 'Umar رضي الله عنهما, based on the variant views of the Shī'ah scholars in this regard²:

لله بلاء فلان فلقد قوم الأود وداوي العمد، و أقام السنة.. و خلف الفتنة، ذهب تقي الثوب، قليل العيب
أصاب خيرها و سبق شرها أدي إلي الله طاعته و اتقاه بحقه

To Allah belongs the credit for the efforts of so and so.³ He straightened the crookedness,⁴ cured the maladies,⁵ established the Sunnah, and left the

1 Ibid.

2 Maytham al-Baḥrānī: *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* 4/97.

3 Meaning his efforts for the path of Allah (see: Maytham al-Baḥrānī: *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* 4/97).

4 Translation is taken from the commentary given in the above mentioned reference.

5 See: The notes of Ṣubḥī Ṣālīḥ on *Nahj al-Balāghah* p. 671.

Fitnah (trial) behind.¹ He departed from this world with a clean garment and with very few faults. He partook of the good of this world and avoided its evil. He fulfilled the right of the obedience of Allah and feared as he was required to.²

This is a very crucial text which debunks all their alleged claims regarding the enmity and tension which existed between ‘Alī عليه السلام and Abū Bakr and ‘Umar عليه السلام.

Narrations of this nature have always baffled the Shī‘ah. This one has in particular because it appears in *Nahj al-Balāghah*, which according to them is a categorically established book. Maytham al-Baḥrānī³ has sketched the nature of this confusion, he says:

واعلم أن الشيعة قد أوردوا هنا سؤالاً فقالوا: إن هذه الممادح التي ذكرها في حق أحد الرجلين تنافي ما أجمعنا عليه من تخطئهم وأخذهما لمنصب الخلافة، فإما أن لا يكون هذا الكلام من كلامه رضي الله عنه وإما أن يكون أجمعنا خطأ.

Know well that the Shī‘ah have raised a question at this point. They say: These feats which are mentioned in praise of one of the two men violate our consensus regarding considering them wrong and believing that they usurped the Khilāfah. Hence either these words are not the words of ‘Alī عليه السلام or our consensus is invalid.

They try to resolve this conundrum by asserting that these words were said by way of Taqiyyah, i.e. he only made mention of these praises in order to rehabilitate the people who believed in the legitimacy of the rule of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar and attract their hearts. In other words, according to them, ‘Alī عليه السلام intended

1 I.e. he left the *Fitnah* behind; he did not reach it, nor did it reach him. (Ibid.)

2 *Nahj al-Balāghah* (the revised version of Ṣubḥī al-Ṣāliḥ) p. 350.

3 Maytham al-Baḥrānī (Kamāl al-Dīn) is one of the scholars of the Twelvers from Baḥrayn. Amongst his works are: *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* and *Tawaffī al-Baḥrayn*. He died in 679 A.H. (See: *Mu‘jam al-Mu‘allifin* 13/55).

to deceive the Ṣaḥābah. He thus expressed sentiments which he did not really hold and he lied in front of the people when delivering the sermon. This is the answer those who claim to be the partisan of ‘Alī عليه السلام give.¹ I do not think any intelligent person will treat it as a satisfactory answer. We, therefore, assert that the consensus of the Shī‘ah is based on deviation and the statement of ‘Alī عليه السلام is based on the truth and the reality, for indeed he was a person who did not fear the criticism of the critics when it came to the dīn of Allah.

Someone could possibly say: The aforementioned narrations are in complete contrast to the previously cited narrations regarding how the Shī‘ah excommunicate the Ṣaḥābah and revile them. In response I say: Yes. Because the very nature of the legacy of the Shī‘ī dogma is contradiction. And their scholars have put a few principles in place in order to do away with such narrations and in order to find a niche out of these contradictions. For example, one of their principles is that this contradiction is actually required in order to conceal the reality of the dogma, thereby not allowing the commonality (the Ahl al-Sunnah) to annihilate it completely.²

When narrations are in conflict with each other they say:

خذوا بما خالف العامة فإن فيه الرشاد

Practice upon that which opposes the commonality, for in it lies guidance.³

It is for this reason that their scholars assert that these positive narrations were articulated by way of Taqiyyah. And also because they are far less than the narrations which contain the excommunication and curses. They thus do not regard them acceptable. Al-Mufid says:

1 Maytham al-Baḥrānī: *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* 4/98.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/65.

3 See p. 553 of this book.

ما خرج للتحقيق لا يكثر روايته عنهم كما تكثر روايات المعمول به.

Those narrations which were said by way of Taqiyyah are not as many in number as are the narrations which are implemented.¹

That is why you will find that the comments of Ibn Bābawayh after the narration which entails the praises of the Ṣaḥābah suggest that it was said by way of Taqiyyah. Similarly you will notice the same in the comments of Maytham al-Baḥrānī.

This being the case, I have only cited these narrations here in order to show the contradictory nature of the Shī'ī dogma to the people of intellect. And in order to guide a person who is in search of the truth that these narrations are based on reality and not on Taqiyyah because of their coherence with the Qur'ān and the consensus of the Ummah. Furthermore, to demonstrate that the doctrine of Taqiyyah has made the dogma a toy in the hands of their scholars which they can use to twist the traditions in any which way they desire. With the result that it has no more remained the religion of the Ahl al-Bayt, but rather the religion of al-Kulaynī, al-Qummī, al-Majlisī, and their likes.

Evidence sourced from reason, history, the categorically established aspects of dīn and the consensus of the Ummah:

Firstly, it is a very well-known fact which is known to the commonality and the erudite that Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ had a very special relationship with Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. In fact they were the closest to him in terms of spending time in his company and always being around him. Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had, through the medium of marriage, developed a relationship with them (they were all his family by law). He loved them immensely and praised them often. Now, they were either upstanding people internally and externally during his lifetime and after his demise, or, conversely, they were not people of upstanding character

1 *Taḥṣīṭ al-I'tiqād* p. 71.

during his lifetime or after his demise. If we postulate that they were not people of upstanding character despite enjoying such proximity to Rasūl Allah ﷺ then one of two conclusions are inevitable. Either Rasūl Allah ﷺ was not aware of their actual condition or he compromised his principles for their sake. Whichever of the two is regarded, it tarnishes the reputation of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. As the poet says:

فإن كنت لا تدري فتلك مصيبة وإن كنت تدري فالمصيبة أعظم

If you do not know, it is a problem and if you know, the problem is even greater.

And if we postulate that they had deviated after previously having upright conduct, then it is a sign of Allah ﷻ leaving his Nabī ﷺ helpless by leaving his bosom associates and his elite Companions to go astray. Whereas Allah ﷻ had promised him that he will make his religion reign supreme over all other religions. So how is it possible for his special and elite Companions to go astray? The Shī'ah thus again are severely tarnishing the reputation of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, as Mālik and others have mentioned:

إنما أراد هؤلاء الرافضة الطعن في رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ليقول قائل: رجل سوء كان له أصحاب سوء، ولو كان رجلاً صالحاً لكان أصحابه صالحين ولهذا قال أهل العلم: إن الرافضة دسيسة الزنادقة.

The intention of the Shī'ah is to tarnish the reputation of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. So that a person can claim that he was a bad person who had bad Companions. Had he been a good person, his Companions would have also been good people. Therefore the scholars say that the Shī'ah are planted by the heretics.¹

Secondly, an apostate only turns apostate due to doubts or temptations. It is a known fact that in the initial stages of Islam the doubts and temptations were much more overwhelming, for the Muslims were very few at that time and the disbelievers were dominant on majority of the land; the Muslims suffered a great

1 Minhāj al-Sunnah 4/122.

deal of hardship, only known to Allah ﷻ, in Makkah at the hands of their polytheist relatives and others which they bore patiently despite its bitterness. They followed Rasūl Allah ﷺ who was alone and poor, lowly and fearful, overpowered and dominated and in whose opposition the entire peninsula had united; despite this they sacrificed their homes and belongings and bid farewell to their social standing and popularity all out of the love of Allah and His Rasūl Allah ﷺ.

They did all of this willingly. If this was the condition of their īmān in the very initial stages of Islam, then one can well imagine what the strength thereof would have been after the realisation of its signs and evidences.¹ Especially when the reason owing to which the Shī'ah excommunicate them, i.e. the allegiance to Abū Bakr instead of 'Alī, did not entail anything so enticing that would prompt them to abandon their faith, lose all their previous feats and sacrifices, and trade the afterlife for this world just because of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. What made them do so? Especially when they allegedly knew that it was disbelief in their Lord and turning away from their dīn. And what made them not obey the alleged order of Rasūl Allah ﷺ regarding the rulership of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ when they knew that doing so was a means of obeying Rasūl Allah ﷺ and steadfastness upon their faith. Is it really possible to conceive that the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār disbelieved in Allah ﷻ due to their loyalty to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ? Or that they preferred not to abide by the order of Rasūl Allah ﷺ regarding the right of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to leadership? Whereas they were the same people who initially sacrificed their homes in search of the grace of Allah and his mercy, and who aided the dīn of Allah and His Rasūl and who were truthful and honest.

Thirdly, the stance of the Shī'ah regarding the excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah necessarily implies the excommunication of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ also because of his failure to uphold the injunctions of Allah. Likewise it necessitates the invalidity and the unauthenticity of the Sharī'ah because of its transmitters being apostates. It leads to criticising the Qur'ān because it reached us through the medium of Abū Bakr,

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/128.

‘Umar, ‘Uthmān, and their brothers. Accomplishing this was the objective of the concocter of this ideology. Hence Abū Zur‘ah says:

إذا رأيت الرجل ينتقص أحد من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فاعلم أنه زنديق، وذلك أن الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم حق والقرآن حق، وإنما أدي إلينا هذا القرآن والسنن أصحاب رسول الله، وإنما يريدون أن يجرحوا شهودنا ليبطلوا الكتاب والسنة. والجرح بهم أولي وهم الزنادقة.

If you see anyone reviling the Companions of Rasūl Allah ﷺ know that he is heretic. This is because Rasūl Allah ﷺ is true and the Qur’ān is true. It was the Companions of Rasūl Allah ﷺ who conveyed his teachings and the Qur’ān to us. Hence they intend to discredit our traditional legacy of the Qur’ān and the Sunnah by discrediting the transmitters thereof. They therefore are more deserving of criticism and they are heretics.¹

The books of the Shī‘ah thus also concede that the first person to concoct this ideology was Ibn Saba’. They say:

أول من أظهر الطعن في أبي بكر وعمر وعثمان الصحابة، وادعي أن عليا عليه السلام أمره بذلك.

He was the first one to revile Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān, and the Ṣaḥābah and the first to disassociate himself from them and the first to claim that ‘Alī ordered him to do so.²

Fourthly, ‘Alī رضي الله عنه did not excommunicate anyone who opposed him or fought against him, not even the Khawārij. He did not even imprison their children and take their belongings as spoils. This is vastly different to the stance of the Ṣaḥābah regarding the the people of Banū Ḥanīfah and their likes, who they pronounced as apostates. ‘Alī رضي الله عنه did not pass a ruling of apostasy against those who fought against him but instead would supplicate that the pleasure of Allah descend upon Ṭalḥah and Zubayr رضي الله عنهما even though they fought him. And he considered them

1 Al-Kifāyah p. 49.

2 Al-Qummī: *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 20; al-Nawbakhtī: *Firaq al-Shī‘ah* p. 19-20.

and the people of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه Muslims. It is authentically established that his announcer had announced on the day of Jamal that no fleeing person should be followed, no wounded person should be killed, and no belongings should be taken as booty.¹ And there are many widespread narrations which prove that he said the following regarding the army of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه:

إنهم جميعا مسلمون، ليسوا كفارا ولا منافقين

They are all Muslims. They are not disbelievers or hypocrites.²

This is also established in the books of the Shī‘ah. Hence it is narrated in their reliable books that Ja‘far narrates from his father that his father ‘Alī رضي الله عنه would not ascribe disbelief or hypocrisy to anyone who fought against him. But he would say, “They have rebelled against us.”³

However, the belief of Taqiyyah which they hold makes their dogma the religion of their scholars and not of the Imāms. Al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī has thus commented with the following remarks after this narration:

أقول هذا محمول علي التقية.

I say that this was by way of Taqiyyah.⁴

In the letter which ‘Alī رضي الله عنه wrote to the people of the various cities he depicts what had transpired between him and the people of Şiffīn. He writes:

وكان بدأ أمرنا التقينا والقوم من أهل الشام، والظاهر أن ربنا واحد ودعوتنا إلي الإسلام واحدة، ولا نستزيدهم في الإيمان بالله والتصديق برسوله، ولا يستزيدوننا. والأمر واحد إلا ما اختلفنا فيه من دم عثمان ونحن منه براء.

1 This is what the Khawārij disagreed with when Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه debated with them (*Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/181).

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/181.

3 *Qurb al-Isnād* p. 62; *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 11/62.

4 *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 11/62.

It all started when we and the people of Syria confronted one another. Obviously our Lord is one and our propagation of Islam is the same. We were not confronting them to increase them in their faith in Allah and in the affirmation of his Rasūl ﷺ. Nor were they confronting us for that. The conflict was for one reason, viz. the blood of ‘Uthmān in which we are completely innocent.¹

He likewise reproached those who criticised Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and his comrades. He said:

إني أكره لكم أن تكونوا سبابين، ولو وصفتهم إعمالهم وذكرتم حالهم كان أصوب في القول وأبلغ في العذر، وقتلتم مكان سبكم إياهم: اللهم احقن دماءنا ودماءهم أصلح ذات بيننا وبينهم.

I dislike that you criticise excessively. But if you describe their crimes and state their condition, that would be more accurate in terms of speech and more effective in absolving you of your responsibility. Likewise it would be better for you to say, “O Allah safeguard our blood and their blood and resolve the differences between us and them.”²

Hence, based on what features in their most authentic books, the tendency of reviling and criticising was not the way of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn.

Fifthly, those whom the Shī‘ah exclude from their blanket ruling of apostasy, like Salmān, ‘Ammār, and Miqdād, they only exclude them assuming that they had the Shī‘ī tendencies of excommunicating Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا, and of considering their rule to be illegitimate. This again is one of the many ploys of the Shī‘ah. For no one is known to have struggled for authority against Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا during their rule; not these people and not anyone else. Salmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was in fact appointed as the governor of Madā’in by ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and he would invite the people to be loyal and obedient to him. Likewise ‘Ammār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was appointed as the governor of Kūfah by ‘Uthmān. And Miqdād رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the

1 *Nahj al-Balāghah* p. 448.

2 *Ibid.* p. 323.

other Ṣaḥābah participated in the expeditions in their eras. So can the deceit of the Shī'ah be successful?¹

Sixthly, the condition of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ is very clear from history and its famous incidents i.e. they did not give preference to anything over Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى even when they were confronted with the most difficult of conditions. They sacrificed their lives for Allah and Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى aided them with his Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and utilised them for the propagation of His dīn. So how can a person who barely knows Allah revile them? Or how can someone who claims to be a Muslim have the audacity to revile and belittle them?² Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī, therefore, says:

علي أنه لو لم يرد من الله عز وجل فيهم شيء مما ذكرناه لأوجبت الحال التي كانوا عليها من الهجرة
الجهاد والنصرة وبذل المهج والأموال وقتل الآباء والأولاد والمناصحة في الدين وقوة الإيمان واليقين
القطع علي عدالتهم والإعتقاد بنزاهتهم.

Even if hypothetically the previously mentioned commendations by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى were not revealed regarding them, their migration, striving, helping the dīn of Allah, sacrificing their lives and belongings, claiming the lives of their fathers and children, well-wishing for the dīn and strong īmān all demand that we conclusively decide that they were people of upstanding conduct and innocent.³

A person who will study the incidents of the life of Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the difficulties and harassments which he and his Companions underwent when the Arabs all united in their attack against them, and the manner in which they bore the persecution of Quraysh in Makkah, persevered the harshness of the boycott in the valley, left their mother-land, families and tribes and migrated to Abyssinia and Madīnah, took up the task of striving in the path of Allah and sacrificed therein, fought their own families and tribes, etc.; I say, if a person studies all of this he will appreciate the value of this unique generation, its strong faith, and its loyalty for the cause of dīn.

1 Abū al-Maḥāsīn al-Wāsiṭī: *al-Munāẓarah* p. 66. Also refer to p. 87 of this book.

2 *Al-Tanbīh wa al-Radd* p. 10- 11.

3 *Al-Kifāyah* p. 49. See also: al-Ījī: *al-Mawāqif* p. 413.

Seventhly, there are many academic evidences and hard historical facts from the life of Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī عليه السلام which establish the true affinity and close relationship which he had with Abū Bakr 'Umar, and 'Uthmān the elite among the Ṣaḥābah عليه السلام. The strongest of evidence in this regard is the wedding of Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī عليه السلام of his daughter Umm Kulthūm to 'Umar عليه السلام.¹ So if 'Umar عليه السلام, according to the Twelvers was worst in his disbelief then even Shayṭān, why do they not for a while reflect over their stance and why do they not realise the falsity of their dogma. For if Abū Bakr and 'Umar عليه السلام were really disbelievers, then for 'Alī عليه السلام to get his daughter Umm Kulthūm married to a disbeliever and an imposter like 'Umar would be making his daughter vulnerable to adultery, for a disbelieving man to have conjugal relations with a Muslim women cannot be termed as anything but adultery.²

An intelligent person who is impartial, free from ulterior motives and is sincere in his partisanship to the Ahl al-Bayt cannot deny this fact, i.e. the fact that there existed amiable relationships, love and respect among the four Khulafā'. Hence when Mu'izz al-Dawlah, Aḥmad ibn Buwayh who was staunch Shī'ī who would revile the Ṣaḥābah, was told that 'Alī عليه السلام wed his daughter to 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb عليه السلام he was immediately gripped with compunction and he said, "I did not know of this." He then repented and gave charity of most of his wealth and freed his slaves. He thereafter desisted from much of his oppression and he cried till he fell unconscious.³ This was because he realised the severity of his crime which made him revile and criticise these poor people after being influenced by the Shī'ah.

And as usual, the scholars of the Shī'ah have again tried to curb the impact of this evidence by forging narrations which state that:

1 See: al-Shaikh al-Farūqī: *'Aqd Umm Kulthūm*; Muḥammad Ṣiddīq: *al-Taḥqīq al-Jalī fī Tazwīj Umm Kulthūm Bint 'Alī*.

2 Al-Sam'ānī: *al-Ansāb* 1/347.

3 Ibn al-Jawzī: *al-Muntaẓam* 7/38-39.

This is the first of our women who was forcibly taken from us.¹

They without realising, made the problem even more complicated. For by the aforementioned assertion they have portrayed Amīr al-Mu'minīn to be a pander who was unable to defend the honour of his family and allowed adultery. Can someone perceive this regarding Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī, may Allah be pleased with him and elevate his status? The lowest of Arabs in stature will defend his integrity and will fight on behalf of the womenfolk of his household, so how can they prove this type of shortfall regarding Amīr al-Mu'minīn who was bold, valiant, the lion of Banū Hāshim, and the lion of Allah among the people of the east and west.²

Hence, ostensibly some of their scholars were not satisfied with this interpretation of the incident so they tried to do away with it by an even more weird assertion; they asserted that Umm Kulthūm was not the daughter of 'Alī عليه السلام but she was a *Jinniyyah* (a female jinn) who took the form of Umm Kulthūm.³

Lastly, another very strong proof is the kinship, and the expression of love which existed between them. For 'Alī, Ḥasan, and Ḥusayn عليه السلام named some of their children with the names Abū Bakr and 'Umar. Will someone ever name his children after his most ardent enemies in terms of hate and disbelief? And can he bear the names of these enemies being continuously repeated in his home multiple times?⁴

1 *Furū' al-Kāfi* 2/10; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 7/434-435.

2 *Al-Suwaydī: Mu'tamar al-Najaf* p. 86.

3 *Al-Anwār al-Nu'māniyyah* 1/83-84. A similar interpretation is mentioned in the books of the *Ismā'īliyyah* (see: *al-Haft al-Sharīf* p. 84).

4 For details in this regard read the book of Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb. He has made mention of the marital-relations which existed between the Ahl al-Bayt and the Ṣaḥābah عليه السلام. And of the children of the Ahl al-Bayt who were named after the three Khulafā' and others among the Ṣaḥābah. (*Ḥamalah Risālah al-Islām al-Awwalūn wa ma Kānū 'Alayhī min al-Maḥabbah wa al-Ta'āwun* p. 11, onwards; *Nash'ah al-Shī'ah wa Taṭawwuruhū* p. 12, onwards. Also refer to what Iḥsān Ilāhī Ḥaḥīr has written in this regard in his book *al-Shī'ah wa Ahl al-Bayt*. There is no need for repetition here.

Chapter Two

‘Iṣmah of the Imāms

The Shī‘ah hold the doctrine of ‘Iṣmah (Infallibility) in great esteem¹ as it is one of the fundamental aspects of their dogma.²

The word ‘Iṣmah according to the Arabs means: protection. And the protection of Allah for his slave is that he protects him from that which can destroy him. Likewise ‘so and so sought the protection of Allah’ means that he was safeguarded by him.³

As for the precise definition of ‘Iṣmah (infallibility) according to its Shī‘ī conception, it differs in the various developmental stages of Shī‘ism and its phases. However, it seems as if the definition thereof has settled upon what the Shaykh of the Shī‘ah in his time, al-Majlisī (the author of *Biḥār al-Anwār*, d. 1111 A.H), has asserted:

اعلم أن الإمامية اتفقوا علي عصمة الأئمة -عليه السلام- من الذنوب -صغيرها وكبيرها- فلا يقع منهم ذنب أصلا لا عمدا ولا نسيانا ولا لخطأ في التأويل ولا للإسهاء من الله سبحانه

Know well that the Imāmiyyah are unanimous regarding the infallibility of the Imāms عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام; they are free from minor and major sins. Hence they can never commit a sin intentionally, forgetfully, due to an error in judgement, or due to Allah سبحانه وتعالى making them heedless.⁴

Al-Majlisī has accorded the Imāms infallibility from all possible perspectives; he has accorded them infallibility from sins of all types and from mistakes, heedlessness, and forgetfulness.

1 ‘Abd Allah Fayyāq: *Tārīkh al-Imāmiyyah* p. 157.

2 Bāqir Sharīf al-Qurashī: *Ḥayāt al-Imām Mūsā ibn Ja‘far* 1/111.

3 *Tahdhīb al-Lughah*: under the root letters عصم

4 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/211; *Mir‘āt al-Uqūl* 4/352.

This type of infallibility, which al-Majlisī claims is the locus of consensus among the Shī'ah, was not enjoyed by the Ambiyā' of Allah ﷺ and his Rasūls, as is understood from the Qur'ān, the Sunnah and the consensus of the Ummah.¹ Hence this understanding of infallibility is foreign to Islam. For the complete negation of heedlessness and forgetfulness from the Imāms is tantamount to likening them to the one who does not slumber and sleep, i.e. Allah. Hence when al-Riḍā, the eighth 'infallible' Imām of the Shī'ah, was told:

إن في الكوفة قوما يزعمون أن النبي صلي الله عليه وآله لم يقع عليه السهو في صلاته

In Kufah there are people who claim that Nabī ﷺ did not err in his ṣalāh.

He said:

كذبوا-لعنهم الله- إن الذي لا يسهو هو الله الذي لا إله إلا هو

They have lied, may Allah curse them. The one who does not err is Allah

² ﷺ

This narration, provided it is sound, implies that the denial of heedlessness and errors, which formed the basis of the doctrine of infallibility according to the later Shī'ah, was in the era of al-Riḍā the belief of just a few people who feigned partisanship for the Ahl al-Bayt and who were not known, either due to their small count or due to them being unimportant, and obscure in their beliefs; they would make this eerie claim regarding the best of creation, i.e. Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allah ﷺ. This extremist stance, due to it giving him resemblance to the one who does not slumber and sleep, was met with curses, refutation, and excommunication by the Imāms of the Shī'ah. So what would the reaction of al-Riḍā be regarding people who make the same claim regarding him and others from his forefathers and progeny? Surely his disapproval would be much more intense.

1 *Fikrah al-Taqrīb* p. 299.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/350; Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī: *Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā* p. 326.

It also implies that this doctrine only came about after the era of al-Riḍā.

This intrigues us to investigate the roots of this doctrine and its development to the phase where it stands today.

The Inception of the Doctrine of ‘Iṣmah and its development

Ibn Taymiyah asserts that the doctrine of infallibility was one of the views of Ibn Saba’.¹ However, I have not come across a report which ascribes the word ‘Iṣmah (infallibility) to Ibn Saba’, even though that which has been reported from him amounts to infallibility and even beyond. For he is reported to have deified Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī عليه السلام.² But he did not coin the doctrine of infallibility as it stands as a Shī‘ī doctrine today. More so when his views were restricted to Amīr al-Mu’minīn to such an extent that he was the first person to concoct the belief of *Tawaqquf*³ among the Shī‘ah, i.e. waiting for the reappearance of Imām ‘Alī and his return.

Al-Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār was of the opinion that the infallibility of the Imām, the idea that he is pure from mistakes and errors in all conditions and that he is not overcome by heedlessness and negligence were not known in the era of the Ṣaḥābah and their successors till the era of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam who took the responsibility of contriving them.⁴

Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb also agrees with him in specifying the era wherein the doctrine of infallibility was born. But he attributes the invention thereof to one of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam’s contemporaries. He says:

و أول من اخترع لهم هذه العقيدة الضالة خبيث يسميه المسلمون شيطان الطاق و تسميه الشيعة (مؤمن آل محمد) و اسمه محمد بن علي الأحول

1 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 4/518; *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/60.

2 *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/86; *al-Tanbīh wa al-Rad* p. 18; *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* p. 21; *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* 1/174. See also: *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 106-107; *al-Rāzī: al-Zīnah* p. 305; *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* 2/183.

3 *Al-Qummī/ Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 20.

4 *Tathbīt Dalā’il al-Nubuwwah* 2/528.

The first person to invent this devious doctrine for them was a wretched person who the Muslims called Shayṭān al-Ṭāq, and the Shī'ah called Mu'min Āl Muḥammad.¹ His name was Muḥammad ibn 'Alī al-Aḥwal.²

And Donaldson hints to the possibility of the doctrine of infallibility coming about in the era of Ja'far al-Ṣādiq.³

It should be noted that Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam and Shayṭān al-Ṭāq were the contemporaries of Ja'far al-Ṣādiq. Hence it is very possible that the Shī'ah began to learn of this doctrine from these individuals in the era of Ja'far al-Ṣādiq. Thereafter it developed and past many phases till it eventually settled on what al-Majlisī explained it to be.

The Different Phases of the Doctrine of 'Iṣmah

When we endeavour to study the texts of the Shī'ah which make mention of infallibility in order to determine the various phases it passed we find that the books of the Shī'ah attribute the following to Zayn al-'Ābidīn 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn:

المعصوم هو من اعتصم بحبل الله، و حبل الله هو القرآن

A Ma'ṣūm (an infallible person) is the one who firmly holds on to the rope of Allah, and the rope of Allah is the Qur'ān.⁴

Whether the attribution of this narration to 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn is authentic or not, it gives us the correct understanding of infallibility which was in line with the beautiful teachings of Islam in those early stages of Shiasm. Hence holding on to the Qur'ān is in essence a source of protection and salvation. But this understanding thereof is not limited to a specific people. For Allah سبحانه وتعالى says:

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 185; Mu'min al-Ṭāq is the name which appears there. Shayṭān al-Ṭāq means devil of the corner and Mu'min al-Ṭāq means the believer of the corner.

2 *Majallah al-Fatḥ* 18/277.

3 Donaldson: *The belief of the Shī'ah* p. 369; Maḥmūd Ṣubḥī: *Naẓariyyah al-Imāmah* p. 124.

4 Ibn Bābawayh: *Ma'ānī al-Akhbār* p. 132; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/194.

وَأَعْتَصِمُوا بِحَبْلِ اللَّهِ جَمِيعًا

And hold firmly to the rope of Allah all together.¹

Likewise Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

وَمَنْ يَعْصِمْ بِاللَّهِ فَقَدْ هُدِيَ إِلَى صِرَاطٍ مُسْتَقِيمٍ

And whoever holds firmly to Allah has [indeed] been guided to a straight path.²

Subsequent to this in the next phase we find that Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam, to whom al-Qaḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār attributes the invention of the doctrine of infallibility, responds with the following when Ḥusayn al-Ashqar poses a question to him:

ما معني قولكم: إن الإمام لا يكون إلا معصوما؟ فقال هشام: سألت أبا عبد الله (جعفر الصادق) عن ذلك فقال: المعصوم هو الممتنع بالله من جميع محارم الله وقال تبارك وتعالى: وَمَنْ يَعْصِمْ بِاللَّهِ فَقَدْ هُدِيَ إِلَى صِرَاطٍ مُسْتَقِيمٍ

“What do you mean when you say that the Imām is not but infallible?”

Hishām said, “I asked Abū ‘Abd Allah regarding this and he said, ‘An infallible person is the one who is protected by Allah from all the prohibitions of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. He then recited the verse, ‘And whoever holds firmly to Allah has [indeed] been guided to a straight path.’”³

Another Shī‘ī by the name Ibn Abī ‘Umayr says the following:

ما استفتدت من هشام بن الحكم في طول صحبتي إياه شيئا أحسن من هذا الكلام في عصمة الإمام وهو: أن الإمام لا يذنب لأن منافذ الذنوب الحرص والحسد والغضب والشهوة، وهذه الأوجه منتفية عن الإمام

1 Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 103.

2 Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 101.

3 Ma‘ānī al-Akhbār p. 132; Biḥār al-Anwār 25/194-195.

I have not learnt anything more beneficial from Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam during the time I stayed in his company than the explanation he gave regarding the infallibility of the Imām. And that is that the Imām does not sin. Because greed, jealousy, anger, and lust are the avenues of sin and they are not found in the Imām.¹

This understanding of infallibility, nonetheless, is nowhere close to the extremist understanding of al-Majlisī. And the implications thereof are not as grave as the later understanding of it which is more extreme in terms of it equating the words of the Imām to revelation which cannot be adulterated from ahead or from behind, and in terms of denying all human defects, like that of heedlessness, negligence, and forgetfulness from them; ultimately elevating them from humans to possessors of divine attributes.

Likewise it should be noted that averring that the Imām is divinely protected from sinning and is propelled to do good implies that he is coerced by Allah. This goes against the stance of the Twelvers regarding *Taqdīr* (pre-destination). For they believe in complete freedom and free will and in man being the creator of his own actions. This is evidence of the fact that this understanding of infallibility precedes their stance on pre-destination which they adopted from the Mu‘tazilāh in the third century.

We therefore find that after the influence of the Mu‘tazilī thought on the Shī‘ī dogma the understanding of infallibility became tainted with some of its ideas, like that of divine *Lutf* (divine grace) and free human will. This is clearly discernible from the definition which al-Mufīd (d. 413 A.H.) gives of infallibility; he says:

بأنها لطف يفعل الله -تعالى- بالمكلف بحيث يمنع منه وقوع المعصية، و ترك الطاعة مع قدرته عليها

Infallibility is the *Lutf*(grace) of Allah with which He favours His responsible

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/192-193; Ibn Bābawayh: *al-Khiṣāl* 1/215; *Ma‘ānī al-Akḥbār* p. 123; *Amālī al-Ṣadūq* p. 375-376.

slave. He by way of it protects him from falling into disobedience and from abandoning good when having the capacity to do it.¹

So based on this definition, the Imām is not coerced by Allah to leave evil, rather Allah showers His *Alṭāf* (grace) upon him owing to which he willingly does not disobey Him. See how he uses the terminology of the Mu‘tazilah to explain the doctrine of infallibility.

Moving on, the doctrine of infallibility did not stop at the extent of negating sins from the Imāms, rather it exceeded that. Hence in the fourth century Ibn Bābawayh asserts the following regarding infallibility in his book *Al-I‘tiqādāt*:

دين الشيعة الإمامية فيقول: اعتقادنا في الأئمة أنهم معصومون مطهرون من كل دنس وأنهم لا يذنبون ذنباً صغيراً ولا كبيراً، ولا يعصون الله ما أمرهم ويفعلون ما يؤمرون و من نفي عنهم العصمة في شيء من أحوالهم فقد جهلهم و من جهلهم فهو كافر، واعتقادنا فيهم أنهم معصومون موصوفون بالكمال والتمام و العلم من أوائل أمورهم و أواخرها لا يوصفون في شيء من أحوالهم بنقص ولا عيبان ولا جهل

Our belief regarding the Imāms is that they are infallible and purified from all defilements. They do not commit any sins, minor or major. They do not disobey Allah in what he has ordered them, and they do as they are told to do. A person who does not belief in their Infallibility in any aspect of their lives is a disbeliever. Likewise whoever does not know about them is also a disbeliever. Our belief regarding them is that they are infallible and they are characterised by perfection, completeness, and knowledge from the beginning of their affairs to the end. In none of their affairs are they ever described as deficient, sinful, or ignorant.²

In this explanation, he denies disobedience, ignorance, and deficiency from the Imāms. And he establishes perfection for them from the beginning of their lives to the end. He also excommunicates whoever does not believe in this. This was thus another phase in the development of the doctrine of infallibility.

1 Al-Mufid: *al-Nukat al-I‘tiqādiyyah* p. 33-34; *Taṣḥīḥ al-I‘tiqād* p. 106; al-Jīlānī: *Tawfīq al-Taṭbīq* p. 16.

2 *Al-I‘tiqādāt* p. 108-109.

But he does not explicitly negate making mistakes as does al-Majlisī and the later Shī'ah scholars. In his book *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh* he rather asserts that negating mistakes from Rasūl Allah ﷺ is the stance of the extremist and the Mufawwiḍah. He says:

إن الغلاة والمفوضة-لعنهم الله-ينكرون سهو النبي-صلي الله عليه وآله- يقولون: لو جاز أن يسهو في الصلاة لجاز أن يسهو في التبليغ، لأن الصلاة فريضة كما أن التبليغ فريضة.. وليس سهو النبي صلي الله عليه وسلم- كسهونا لأن سهوه من الله- عز وجل- وإنما أسهاه ليعلم أنه بشر مخلوق فلا يتخذ ربا معبودا دونه و ليعلم الناس بسهوه حكم السهو، و كان شيخنا محمد بن الحسن بن أحمد بن الوليد يقول: أول درجة في الغلو نفي السهو عن النبي صلي الله عليه وسلم و أنا أحتسب الأجر في تصنيف كتاب مفرد في إثبات سهو النبي و الرد علي منكبيه

The extremist and the Mufawwiḍah, may the curse of Allah be upon them, negate the mistakes of Nabī ﷺ. They say, “If it is possible for him to err in ṣalāh then it is possible for him to err in his propagation of dīn as well, for just as ṣalāh is an obligatory injunction, so is propagation an obligatory injunction...”

Whereas Nabī's ﷺ mistakes are not like our mistakes. For Allah ﷻ made him err so that it is understood that he is a created human and thus is not taken as a deity who is worshipped besides Allah ﷻ. And so that the rulings of erring are derived from his mistakes. Our teacher Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Aḥmad ibn al-Walīd used to say, “The first step to extremism is the negation of mistakes from Nabī ﷺ.” And I hope of reward from Allah ﷻ in compiling a book to prove the mistakes of Nabī ﷺ and refuting the claims of those who deny them.¹

As is clear from this narration, Ibn Bābawayh who is the leader of the Shī'ah, as they call him, disapproves the claim of those who assert that Nabī ﷺ did not err. So how could it be true for the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt who were less than him in status? He likewise considers the negation of erring to be indicative of extremism and says that it is the view of the extremists. He likewise points

1 *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh* 1/234.

out that the negation of erring implies the likening of the creation to the Creator Most High.

Hence the negation of erring is the addition of the later Shī'ah to the doctrine of infallibility. That is why all the reports which their early scholars allegedly narrate from the Imāms oppose it. For example: Abū 'Abd Allah would say the following when asked about erring:

أو ينفلت من ذلك أحد ربما أقعدت الخادم خلفي يحفظ علي صلاتي

Can anyone escape therefrom? At times I make my servant stand behind me so that he monitors my ṣalāh.¹

And as has passed previously, al-Riḍā would curse the one who negated erring from Rasūl Allah ﷺ and he would say:

إن الذي لا يسهو هو الله سبحانه

The one who does not err is Allah سبحانه وتعالى.

And the books of the Shī'ah have reported narration regarding the Prophet ﷺ erring in his ṣalāh.²

It is eerie indeed that despite their consensus being violated by the Shī'ī scholars of the fourth century they still furnish it as evidence for their stance. It is the temptation of extremism which makes them say:

إن أصحابنا الإمامية أجمعوا علي عصمة الأئمة- صلوات الله عليهم - من الذنوب الصغيرة والكبيرة عمدا وخطا و نسيانا من وقت ولادتهم إلي أن يلقوا الله عز و جل

Our Imāmī scholars are unanimous regarding the infallibility of the Imāms from all types of minor and major sins, whether they be intentionally, by

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/351.

2 *Man lā Yaḥḍurhū al-Faqīh* 1/233.

mistaken, or forgetfully; from the time they were born till when they will meet Allah ¹ سُبْحَانَكَ رَبِّيَ

When they are asked that how can there be consensus in this regard when your scholar Ibn Bābawayh and his teacher Ibn al-Walīd have opposed your stance? They say:

إن خروجهما لا يخل بالإجماع لكونهما معروف النسب

Their opposition does not really violate the consensus due to them having a known lineage.²

Which implies that the identity of some or all of those who are of the opinion of complete infallibility is not known. It is thus possible that the hidden Mahdī emerged from his occultation and voiced his opinion with them and it is his opinion which forms the basis of their consensus.³ In other words, in establishing the validity of their consensus it is sufficient to prove the possibility of the hidden infallible Imām being on the side of those who do not ascribe mistakes and errors to the Imāms.

Astonishing indeed! They reject clear narrations of their Imāms which prove mistakes which appear in their seminal works but cling onto a consensus which rests upon the possible backing of the hidden Imām.

But at the end of the day, the Shī'ī dogma is not the creed of the Imāms, rather it is the creed of their scholars.

Al-Majlisī was baffled when he saw the copious narrations which oppose the consensus of his fellow scholars. He thus says:

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/350-351.

2 *Ibid.* 25/351.

3 Refer to the section of consensus.

المسألة بغاية الإشكال لدلالة كثير من الأخبار والآيات علي صدور السهو عنهم، وإطباق الأصحاب إلا من شذ منهم علي عدم الجواز

This is a very difficult issue. For there are many narrations and verses which prove that the Imāms made mistakes. Whereas the consensus of our friends is on the impossibility of them making mistakes.¹

The aforementioned is an acknowledgement from al-Majlisī that the consensus of the later Shīʿī scholars regarding the infallibility of the Imāms opposes their narrations completely. It is also evidence of the fact that they at times concur upon complete misguidance and upon issues which are not backed by any evidence whatsoever.

Their evidence regarding the Infallibility of the Imāms

Their evidence from the Qurʾān:

In spite of the fact that the Qurʾān does not contain any mention of the Twelve Imāms, let alone their infallibility, the Twelvers cling on to the Qurʾān to prove the doctrine of infallibility. And all their scholars unanimously try to establish it with the following verse:

وَإِذِ ابْتَلَىٰ إِبْرَاهِيمَ رَبُّهُ بِكَلِمَاتٍ فَأَتَمَّهُنَّ قَالَ إِنِّي جَاعِلُكَ لِلنَّاسِ إِمَامًا قَالَ وَمِنْ ذُرِّيَّتِي قَالَ لَا يَنَالُ عَهْدِي الظَّالِمِينَ

And [mention, O Muḥammad], when Ibrāhīm was tried by his Lord with words [i.e., commands] and he fulfilled them. [Allah] said, “Indeed, I will make you a leader for the people.” [Ibrāhīm] said, “And of my descendants?” [Allah] said, “My ‘Ahd (covenant), does not include the oppressors.”²

In his *Biḥār al-Anwār* al-Majlisī has initiated a chapter pertaining to infallibility

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/351.

2 *Sūrah al-Baqarah*: 124.

with this verse. The chapter is *Chapter regarding the necessity of infallibility for the Imām*.¹

Likewise many contemporary scholars as well use this verse to establish the infallibility of the Imāms; they do not present any other verse in substantiation. Some being Muḥsin al-Amīn² and Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā' who asserts that this verse explicitly establishes the infallibility of the Imāms.³

The author of *Majma' al-Bayān* takes the responsibility of expounding on the manner in which their scholars infer evidence from the purport of this verse; he says:

استدل أصحابنا بهذه الآية علي أن الإمام لا يكون إلا معصوما من القبايح، لأن الله - سبحانه - نفى أن ينال عهده الذي هو الإمامة ظالم، و من ليس بمعصوم فقد يكون ظالما إما لنفسه، وإما لغيره

Our scholars have used this verse as evidence to prove that the Imām is not but immune from all types of vice. Because Allah ﷻ in this verse clearly states that an oppressor is not eligible for his 'Ahd, vicegerency⁴. And a person who is not infallible will most certainly oppress; he will either oppress himself or he will oppress others.

If it is said that an oppressor is not eligible whilst he is an oppressor, but if he repents, he no more remains an oppressor and hence becomes eligible.

The answer would be: Even if he repents, he is still included in the verse because of previously having oppressed. Hence when Allah has denied an oppressor the privilege then he has decreed that he will never attain it. And the verse is completely general, it is not specific to any time, hence

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/191.

2 *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1/458.

3 *Aṣl al-Shī'ah* p. 59.

4 The early scholars have differed as to the meaning of 'Ahd. But the Shī'ah only take that meaning which is in harmony with their desires.

it should be kept general and inclusive of all times. An oppressor will not attain the privilege of vicegerency even if he repents later.¹

Critiquing their evidence:

Firstly, the early scholars have differed as to the precise meaning of 'Ahd. Ibn 'Abbās and al-Suddī say that 'Ahd in the verse translates as *Nubuwwah* (prophethood). Mujāhid says that it means leadership, i.e. I will not make an oppressor a leader whose example can be followed. Qatādah, Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī, 'Aṭā', al-Ḥasan, and 'Ikrimah are of the opinion that an oppressor will not enjoy the covenant of Allah *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى* in the afterlife. As for this life, he will enjoy it due to which he will be safe and live enjoyably. al-Zujāj agrees and says that this is a very good interpretation, i.e. the oppressors will not enjoy my protection, meaning that I will not protect them from my punishment; and 'oppressor' means a polytheist. Al-Rabī' ibn Anas and al-Ḍaḥḥāk say that 'Ahd means dīn. The verse will then mean that the oppressors will not be blessed with the dīn of Allah. Don't you see that Allah *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى* says:

وَبَارَكْنَا عَلَيْهِ وَعَلَىٰ إِسْحَاقَ وَمِنْ ذُرِّيَّتِهِمَا مُحْسِنٌ وَظَالِمٌ لِّنَفْسِهِ مِيقِنٌ

And we blessed him and Ishāq. But among their descendants is the doer of good and the clearly unjust to himself [i.e., sinner].²

Allah *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى* in this verse says that not all of your posterity will be on guidance, O Ibrāhīm.

And lastly Ibn 'Abbās has narrated the following: My 'Ahd will not benefit the oppressors means that the oppressors do not deserve loyalty in an agreement. Hence when you enter into an agreement with them they violate it.³

1 Al-Ṭabarsī: *Majma' al-Bayān* 1/201; see also: al-Ṭūsī: *al-Tibyān* 1/449; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/191.

2 Sūrah al-Ṣaffāt: 113.

3 *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 2/20, onwards; *Tafsīr al-Baghawī* 1/112; Ibn 'Aṭīyah: *al-Muḥarrar al-Wajīz* 1/250; al-Qurṭubī: *al-Jāmi' li Ahkām al-Qur'ān* 2/108; *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 1/172-173; al-Shawkānī: *Fath al-Qadīr* 1/138; al-Ālūsī: *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī* 1/377; *Tafsīr al-Qasimī* 2/245-246.

As you can see, the early scholars greatly differed as to the precise interpretation of the verse; it has no connection at all with leadership according to most of them. Even those who interpret it as leadership, intend leadership in knowledge, piety, and being role models, not Imāmah based on its Shī'ī conception.

Secondly, even if the verse is regarding Imāmah, in no way does it establish infallibility. Because it is not possible to say that a person who does not do wrong does not err, forget, or is not overtaken by heedlessness, etc., as is the understanding of infallibility according to the Shī'ah. Or else their stance would imply that a person who forgets is an oppressor and a person who errs is an oppressor. This of course is not in harmony with the teachings of Islam and no one agrees with them regarding it as well. Hence there is a very big difference between establishing infallibility and negating oppression. Because negating oppression proves justice but not infallibility.

Thirdly, it is not correct to say that a person who repents from his oppression is still considered an oppressor and that repentance does not avail him in the alleviation thereof. Because the greatest oppression is ascribing partners to Allah ﷻ: Allah ﷻ says:

الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَلَمْ يَلْبِسُوا إِيمَانَهُمْ بِظُلْمٍ

They who believe and do not mix their belief with injustice.¹

Thereafter Allah ﷻ explains the oppression mentioned in this verse in another verse:

إِنَّ الشِّرْكَ لَظُلْمٌ عَظِيمٌ

Indeed, association [with Him] is great oppression.²

1 Sūrah al-An'ām: 82.

2 Sūrah Luqmān: 13.

But then too Allah ﷻ announces the following regarding the disbelievers:

قُلْ لِلَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا إِنْ يَنْتَهُوا يُغْفَرْ لَهُمْ مَا قَدْ سَلَفَ

Say to those who have disbelieved [that] if they cease, what has previously occurred will be forgiven for them.¹

But the Shī' reasoning demands that a person who ascribes partners to Allah ﷻ even for a moment, or a person who commits a sin, even though minor, is an oppressor from who the trait of oppression becomes inseparable. Based on this, if a person who ascribes partners to Allah ﷻ accepts Islam he is still a polytheist because oppression is ascribing partners to Allah ﷻ.²

This extreme stance makes them even more staunch than the Khawārij who only establish the punishment for a perpetrator of a major sin who does not repent from his sin.

Aside from Shari'ah, convention, and language, it is an obvious aspect even according to reason that a person who repents and makes amends after his disbelief or oppression cannot be called a disbeliever or an oppressor. Or else it would be permissible to call an old man a child, a person who is awake a sleeper, a poor person rich, a satiated person hungry, and a dead person alive and vice versa. Likewise it would necessitate that the oath of a person who swears not to greet a disbeliever and then greets a Muslim who was previously a disbeliever be violated. Whereas no one is of that opinion.³

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 38.

2 Even they take oppression to mean polytheism. Because their main objective is to invalidate the rule of Abū Bakr and 'Umar رضي الله عنهما due to them accepting īmān after polytheism. And it did not part from them after they accepted īmān according to the Shī'ah. That is why al-Kulaynī says, "This verse nullifies the rule of every oppressor." (*Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/199)

3 Al-Ālūsī: *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī* 1/377.

It is also a well-established fact that sometimes a person who repents from his oppression turns out to be better than a person who did not fall into oppression at all. Any person who believes that a person who did not disbelieve, murder or sin is necessarily better than a person who accepted *īmān* after disbelief, attained guidance after deviance, and repented after sinning; has indeed opposed the undeniable history of Islam. Because it is fact that the forerunners of Islam (who were previously disbelievers) are more virtuous than their children. Can any intelligent person ever equate the children of the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār to their fathers in rank?¹

This substantiation of theirs also demands that all the Muslims, including the Shī'ah and the Ahl al-Bayt (besides those who they accord infallibility) be considered oppressors due to them not being infallible. Whereas their scholar al-Ṭūsī says that the title oppressor is a bad title and should only be used for a person who is deserving of the wrath of Allah, as in the verse:

أَلَا لَعْنَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَى الظَّالِمِينَ

The curse of Allah is upon the oppressors.²

Lastly, I end of the critique with what one of the scholars of the Zaydiyyah has mentioned in refutation of the substantiation of the Shī'ah from this verse. He says:

احتج بعض الرافضة بالآية علي أن الإمامة لا يستحقها من ظلم مرة، ورام الطعن في إمامة أبي بكر و عمر، وهذا لا يصح لأن العهد إن حمل علي النبوة فلا جحة، وإن حمل علي الإمامة فمن تاب من الظلم لا يوصف بأنه ظالم، ولم يمنع-تعالى- من نيل العهد إلا حال كونه ظالما

Some of the Shī'ah draw evidence from this verse to prove that a person who was guilty of oppression once in his life is not deserving of leadership,

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/301-303.

2 *Sūrah Hūd*: 18. The text appears in: *al-Tibyān* 1/185.

thereby intending to illegitimate the rule of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما. But this is incorrect. Because if the word ‘Ahd is taken in the meaning of Nubuwwah then it is not evidence for the Shī‘ah. And if it is taken in the meaning of leadership, then the one who repents from his oppression cannot be called an oppressor. And Allah سبحانه وتعالى has not deprived him from leadership except when he is an oppressor.¹

Their evidence from the Sunnah

They present some of the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah in order to establish their case against the Ahl al-Sunnah and in order to beguile their people into believing that the issue of infallibility is a locus of consensus between both parties. However, all these narrations are either outright lies or very far from what they try to prove. The discussion in this regard has passed already in the section pertaining to Imāmah.

Those narrations which they present are mostly related to the Ahl al-Bayt, but they cannot serve as evidence for the Twelvers because the Twelvers do not have any association whatsoever with the Ahl al-Bayt, besides, of course, the artificial relationship they claim to have with some members thereof, i.e. ‘Alī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهم and some members of the posterity of Ḥusayn. Even so, their relationship with the Ahl al-Bayt has long ended with the death of Ḥasan al-‘Askarī who died without having any children in 260 A.H. Since then they are affiliated to scholars who claim to be the representatives of a fictitious person who does not exist. These scholars are the people who have taken this cult to those horrendous ideas and beliefs some of which we have studied in the previous pages.

Likewise, in the previous pages some examples of how they excommunicate the Ahl al-Bayt have also passed. Therefore their claim that the Ahl al-Bayt are infallible is just a mere deception.

1 Yūsuf ibn Aḥmad al-Zaydī: *al-Thamarāt al-Yāni‘ah* (manuscript) 1/60.

Nonetheless, the Shīrah try to establish the infallibility of the Imāms with narrations which the author of *al-Kāfī*, Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, al-Majlisī, and their likes narrate. Narrations whose very wording is reprehensible let alone their chains of transmission. Al-Majlisī for example has cited twenty three narrations from his scholars al-Qummī, al-‘Ayyāshī, al-Mufīd, and others in the chapter he has dedicated to infallibility. He has cited all of them after presenting the aforementioned verse of Sūrah al-Baqarah wherefrom their substantiation is utterly incorrect.

As to al-Kulaynī, he has established many chapters in his *al-Kāfī* regarding the alleged infallibility of the Imāms. Therein he cites multiple narrations which he allegedly narrates from the Hidden Imām. These narrations suggest that the Imāms claimed that they were infallible, rather the partners of Rasūl Allah ﷺ in his prophethood, and possessors of some of the divine attributes; this has passed previously in the chapter regarding their beliefs regarding the fundamentals of dīn. You will find an example of this in the chapter: *Chapter regarding the Imāms being the Pillars of the Earth*. In this chapter he cites three narrations which prove that the Twelve Imāms are like Rasūl Allah ﷺ in loyalty being mandatory for them, in virtue, and in their duties. Hence it is reported that after the demise of Rasūl Allah ﷺ ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and the remaining Imāms are deserving of the same level of loyalty which Rasūl Allah ﷺ deserved.¹ These narrations thereafter go on to raise ‘Alī رضي الله عنه beyond the position of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and equate him to Allah سبحانه وتعالى. Hence it is reported:

أعطيت خصالا لم يعطهن أحد قبلي، علمت علم المنايا و البلايا.. فلم يفتني ما سبقني و لم يعزب عني ما غاب عني

I have been given such attributes which no one before me was given; I possess the knowledge of deaths and calamities, that which has preceded me is not unknown to me and that which is hidden from is not away from me.²

1 *Uṣūl al-kāfī* 1/198.

2 *Ibid.* 1/197.

Whereas the only one who possesses the knowledge of deaths and calamities is Allah ﷻ. Allah says:

وَمَا تَدْرِي نَفْسٌ مَّاذَا تَكْسِبُ غَدًا وَمَا تَدْرِي نَفْسٌ بِأَيِّ أَرْضٍ تَمُوتُ

And no soul perceives what it will earn tomorrow, and no soul perceives in what land it will die.¹

Likewise the one who nothing is hidden from and who nothing of the creation can surpass is Allah ﷻ. Allah says:

لَا يَعْزُبُ عَنْهُ مِثْقَالُ ذَرَّةٍ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَلَا فِي الْأَرْضِ

Not absent from Him is an atom's weight within the heavens or within the earth.²

So it is not just a matter of infallibility, rather it is a matter of progression therefrom to prophethood and deification, the aftermath of which is the renunciation of Islam.

There are many chapters in *al-Kāfī* which assert the same.³ All these chapters contain the narrations of false prophets and heretics across history. It is just that they ascribed them to the pure household of Nabī ﷺ.

1 Sūrah Luqmān: 34.

2 Sūrah Saba': 3.

3 See: *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*: Chapter regarding Loyalty to the Imāms being Compulsory 1/185: therein there are seventeen narrations; Chapter regarding the Imāms being the Administrators of the Matters of Allah ﷻ and the Treasurers of his Knowledge 1/192: therein there are six narrations; Chapter regarding the Imāms being the Vicegerents of Allah on the Land and the Medium through which He is Reached 1/193; therein there are three narrations among many other chapters and narrations whose falsity is categorically known in the dīn of Islam.

Their Logical Substantiations for the Doctrine of Infallibility:

Their logical substantiations for the infallibility of the Imāms can easily be condensed in one claim. And that is the claim that the entire Ummah is prone to mistakes and misguidance and the Imām is the only one who can save them from misguidance.

All their evidences revolve around this axis. Hence they assert that the Ummah requires an infallible leader who will rectify its mistakes. If he also has the potential to make mistakes, then another person will be required to correct his mistakes and this will then lead to infinite regress. That is why it is important to believe in the infallibility of the Imām.

This implies that their reliance is upon the lone Imām and not upon the Ummah. They also aver that he is the protector of the Sharī'ah. The Qur'ān, the Sunnah, and the consensus of the Ummah thus do not enjoy any credence.¹

The reality, however, is that this entire argument is baseless due to the fact that the Ummah is preserved/infallible as a whole through the medium of the Qur'ān and the Sunnah, i.e. the Ummah will never unite upon misguidance. Hence the infallibility of the Ummah as a whole makes it independent from the infallibility of an Imām. The following is what the scholars have said in connection with the infallibility of the Ummah:

When any of the previous nations would deviate and corrupt its dīn, Allah ﷻ would send a prophet to them with the truth. In this Ummah specifically, there is no Nabī to come after its Nabī, hence its infallibility is equivalent to prophethood. Hence no one will endeavour to distort any of its teachings but that Allah ﷻ will give rise to someone who will point out his blunders in his corruption. This is exactly why Allah ﷻ

1 See: Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī: *Kashf al-Murād* p. 390-391; *Nahj al-Mustarshidīn* p. 63; *al-Alfayn* p. 56, onwards; al-Qazwīnī: *al-Shī'ah fī 'Aqā'idihim* p. 368-369; al-Zanjānī: *'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah* p. 77; Hāshim Ma'rūf al-Ḥusainī: *Uṣūl al-Tashayyū'* p. 131-132.

has coupled the way of the believers to obedience to him and to his Nabī ﷺ in the verse:

وَمَنْ يُشَاقِقِ الرَّسُولَ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا تَبَيَّنَ لَهُ الْهُدَىٰ وَيَتَّبِعْ غَيْرَ سَبِيلِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ تُوَلِّهِ مَا تَوَلَّى
وَتُصْلِهِ جَهَنَّمَ ۖ وَسَاءَتْ مَصِيرًا

And whoever opposes the Messenger after guidance has become clear to him and follows other than the way of the believers – We will give him what he has taken and drive him into Hell, and evil it is as a destination.¹

The idea of the immunity of the Ummah from misguidance, as is established in many Sharī texts, therefore, is in complete contrast with idea of the infallibility of just one individual among the Muslims which posits the possibility of the entire Ummah being misguided in his absence.²

Furthermore, all the logical reasons for the need for an infallible Imām (with which they have filled many a pages) were all fulfilled by the existence of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. That is why at times of dispute the Ummah is required to refer its conflicts back to the Qur’ān and the Sunnah Rasūl Allah ﷺ came with, but not to the Imām. Allah ﷻ says:

فَإِنْ تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ

And if you disagree over anything, refer it to Allah and the Messenger.³

The scholars explain: i.e. to the book of Allah and to his Nabī whilst he is alive or to his Sunnah after his demise.⁴ And thanks to the guidance of the Qur’ān and the

1 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 115.

2 *Al-Muntaqā* p. 410.

3 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 59.

4 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr: *al-Tamhīd* 4/264.

Sunnah it will as a whole not unite upon deviation. Because there will be no era which will be void of people who will abide by them till the Day of Judgment.

This is exactly why the evidence of Allah ﷻ was established against the creation through the medium of the prophets. Allah ﷻ says:

إِنَّا أَوْحَيْنَا إِلَيْكَ كَمَا أَوْحَيْنَا إِلَى نُوحٍ وَالنَّبِيِّينَ مِنْ بَعْدِهِ إِلَى قَوْلِهِ: لَيْتَ لَا يَكُونُ لِلنَّاسِ عَلَى اللَّهِ حُجَّةٌ
بَعْدَ الرُّسُلِ

Indeed, we have revealed to you, [O Muḥammad], as we revealed to Nūḥ and the prophets after him... (until the verse:) so that mankind will have no argument against Allah after the messengers.¹

Allah ﷻ in this verse does not make mention of the Imāms. This is a refutation of those who make the entire Ummah independent upon the Imāms.²

Likewise the end result of all their logical arguments for the need of an infallible Imām, without who the Ummah will not enjoy safety and pure faith, is the invalidation of the doctrine of infallibility. This is due to fact that the requirements of Imāmah were not fulfilled by their Imāms.

For instance, to prove this it will suffice to note that after the year 260 A.H. the emergence of an Imām came to an end. Whether it is believed that he did not exist, as was the view of the majority of the sects which emerged after the demise of Ḥasan al-‘Askarī, the view of the family of Ḥasan al-‘Askarī—at the forefront being his brother Ja‘far—and as is established by the scholars of genealogy and history; or that he existed but went into occultation, as is the view of the Twelvers. Whichever of the two is asserted, it is quite clear that the Ummah did not benefit from this alleged Mahdī in the matters of its dīn or worldly life. This is such a flaw in the Twelver dogma that cannot be undone; it leaves no regard or weight for any of its assertions and evidences.

1 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 165.

2 Ibn Taymiyah: *al-Fatāwā* 19/66.

Similarly, none of his forefathers before him, with the exception of ‘Alī and Ḥasan رضي الله عنهما prior to his relinquishment, took charge of the affairs of the Ummah. The scholars, therefore, say that the Shī‘ah do not have any evidence whatsoever to back the doctrine of infallibility besides their claim that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, owing to his grace and the benefit of the Ummah, has not left the world void of an infallible Imām at any given time. And that also is flawed. Because it is well-known that the Ummah did not receive any grace or benefit from the Mahdī or his forefathers as it received from Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ after emigration. For he was the leader of the believers whose obedience was compulsory upon them and through whose medium they received bliss and success. After his rule no one for whom they claim infallibility assumed leadership besides ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. And it is fact that the benefit and the grace the believers enjoyed during the rule of the first three Khulafā’ was by far more than the grace and the benefit it enjoyed during the rule of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه which was filled with wars, tribulations, and disunity.¹

As for those besides ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, people would benefit from their knowledge and piety just as they would benefit from their contemporaries; ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, his son Abū Ja‘far and his son Ja‘far would impart knowledge to the people just like other scholars of their time. In fact in their time there were people more knowledgeable than them and who benefitted the Ummah more than them, as is known to the erudite. Even if we, for argument sake, consider them to have been more knowledgeable and of more benefit to the Ummah, then too the scholars of dīn could not possibly have the same influence the rulers and kings had in enforcing the truth and forcibly inhibiting evil.

As for the remaining Imāms who followed after these three, viz. the ‘Askariyīn, they were not known to possess knowledge which benefitted the Ummah, nor did they have any authority wherefrom the Ummah benefitted. Rather they were like the other Hāshimīs who deserved honour and status. They had the necessary knowledge of Islam which others besides them also had and which many laymen also possess. The scholars thus did not benefit from them as they did from the previous three.²

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/104.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/248.

A general analysis of the doctrine of the infallibility of the Imāms

The claim of Infallibility for the Imāms smacks of assimilating them to the Ambiyā'. For it is compulsory to obey an infallible in everything he says; it is not permissible to oppose him in any way. This is the speciality of the Ambiyā', which is why Allah ﷻ has ordered us to believe in what he revealed to them. He says:

قُولُوا آمَنَّا بِاللَّهِ وَمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَيْنَا وَمَا أُنْزِلَ إِلَىٰ إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَإِسْمَاعِيلَ وَإِسْحَاقَ وَيَعْقُوبَ وَالْأَسْبَاطِ وَمَا أُوتِيَ مُوسَىٰ وَعِيسَىٰ وَمَا أُوتِيَ النَّبِيُّونَ مِنْ رَبِّهِمْ لَا نُفَرِّقُ بَيْنَ أَحَدٍ مِنْهُمْ وَنَحْنُ لَهُ مُسْلِمُونَ

Say, [O believers], “We have believed in Allah and what has been revealed to us and what has been revealed to Ibrāhīm and Ismā‘īl and Ishāq and Ya‘qūb and the Descendants and what was given to Mūsā and ‘Isā and what was given to the prophets from their Lord. We make no distinction between any of them, and we are Muslims [in submission] to Him.”¹

Allah ﷻ in this verse orders us to proclaim that we believe in what the Ambiyā' were given. Hence having faith in the Ambiyā' and proclaiming that faith is our duty. This is unanimously accepted by all Muslims. So whoever attributes infallibility to anyone after the Ambiyā' has indeed attributed the essence of prophethood to him even though he does not accord him the title of prophethood.²

This is in clear contrast with the Qur'ān, the Sunnah, the consensus of the Ummah, and its scholars.

As for its opposition of the Qur'ān, Allah ﷺ says:

أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ وَأَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ وَأُولِي الْأَمْرِ مِنْكُمْ فَإِنْ تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 136.

2 Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/174.

Obey Allah and obey the Messenger and those in authority among you.
And if you disagree over anything, refer it to Allah and the Messenger.¹

Allah ﷻ has not ordered us to refer to anyone in our disputes besides Allah and His Rasūl ﷺ. Had there been an infallible besides Rasūl Allah ﷺ, Allah ﷻ would have ordered us to refer our disputes to him. This establishes that no one is infallible besides Rasūl Allah ﷺ.²

Likewise Allah ﷻ says:

وَمَنْ يُطِيعِ اللَّهَ وَالرَّسُولَ فَأُولَٰئِكَ مَعَ الَّذِينَ أَنْعَمَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِمْ مِنَ النَّبِيِّينَ وَالصَّدِيقِينَ وَالشَّهَدَاءِ
وَالصَّالِحِينَ وَحَسُنَ أُولَٰئِكَ رَفِيقًا

And whoever obeys Allah and the Messenger – those will be with the ones upon whom Allah has bestowed favour of the prophets, the steadfast affirmers of truth, the martyrs and the righteous. And excellent are those as companions.³

And Allah says:

وَمَنْ يَعْصِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ فَإِنَّ لَهُ نَارَ جَهَنَّمَ خَالِدًا فِيهَا أَبَدًا

And whoever disobeys Allah and His Messenger – then indeed, for him is the fire of Hell; they will abide therein forever.⁴

Hence the Qur’ān in multiple places establishes that whoever obeys Rasūl Allah ﷺ will be from the people of good fortune, the Qur’ān does not place the condition of obeying any other infallible person besides him. And whoever

1 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 59.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/105.

3 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 69.

4 Sūrah al-Jinn: 23.

disobeys Rasūl Allah ﷺ will be deserving of the punishment of Allah ﷻ, even if we hypothetically assume that he obeyed an infallible person.

Apart from Rasūl Allah ﷺ, regarding everyone else the scholars of the Qur'ān and the Sunnah are unanimous that some of his statements and opinions are worth acceptance and some not. It is only compulsory for a person to believe in everything Rasūl Allah ﷺ informed us of, follow all his instructions, refrain from his prohibitions and worship Allah ﷻ in the ways he has institutionalised. Because he is the infallible being who did not speak based on his desires; whatever he said was revelation through and through.

There is ample evidence for this in the Sunnah, but the Shī'ah only consider the verdicts of their Imāms to be of worth. Therefore ahead I shall present the verdicts of the Imāms which debunk the doctrine of infallibility.

In *Nahj al-Balāghah*, a word of which they do not doubt, a narration which debunks all of their claims regarding the infallibility of the Imāms appears. It says that Amīr al-Mu'minīn said:

لا تخالطوني بالمصانعة ولا تظنوا بي استقلا في حق قيل لي، ولا التماس إعظام النفس فإنه من استقل الحق أن يقال بحق، أو مشورة بعدل، فإني لست في نفسي بفوق أن أخطيء ولا آمن ذلك من فعلي

Do not socialise with me with dissimulation. And do not think that I consider the truth which is said to me to be a burden and that I seek to aggrandize myself. For verily a person who treats the truth that is said to him as a burden and dislikes that he be reminded of justice, finds it difficult to practice upon them. Hence do not withhold the proclamation of truth and the advising of justice. Because I do not consider myself immune from mistakes and nor am I sure that I will never err.¹

Amīr al-Mu'minīn in this narration is advising his friends not to hesitate in advising him and voicing their opinions to him and is telling them not to be

1 *Nahj al-Balāghah* 3/175.

barred from doing so by dissimulation and flattery. Likewise he is advising them not to assume that he will not accept the truth if it said to him considering it to be a burden or due to regarding himself beyond reformation. For verily a ruler who does not accept the suggestions of his subjects and is not happy with people telling him that he is wrong is very far from practicing the truth and justice. Simply because a person who considers the advice of others to be a burden is the most incapable of implementing it. Hence what he is implying here is that advise me and voice the truth before me because the entire Ummah as a whole is closer to infallibility and the truth, but a person by himself is not immune from erring. Hence he completely debunks the infallibility that the Shī'ah attribute to him. Instead he emphasises that he does not have any immunity against erring. He likewise does not proclaim that he is independent of consulting his subjects, rather he presses upon them that they advise him of the truth and justice, because the Ummah will never unite upon misguidance but an individual thereof has the potential of going astray. This very clearly proves that infallibility is the invention of the Shī'ah.

Likewise the following narration also appears in *Nahj al-Balāghah*:

لا بد للناس من أمير بر أو فاجر يعمل في إمرته المؤمن، و يجمع به الفياء و يقاتل به العدو و تأمن به السيل، و يؤخذ به للضعيف من القوي

The people have to have a ruler, pious or impious, under whose rule a believer can freely practice, booty can be accumulated, the enemy can be subdued, roads can be secured and the rights of the weak can be claimed from the strong.¹

As you can see, he does not stipulate infallibility as a requirement for the ruler and he does not hint to it even in any way. Rather he says that such a ruler has to be appointed through whose rule the well-being of the people and the state is taken care of. He does not say that an infallible Imām should take charge of the affairs

1 *Nahj al-Balāghah* p. 82.

of the Ummah and that every flag that is raised before the flag of the infallible Mahdī is a flag of ignorance, as the books of the Shī'ah assert. He likewise does not confine rulership to the twelve infallible Imāms and does not excommunicate the remaining Muslim rulers, as is the view of the Shī'ah. Instead he highlights the need for a ruler, even though sinful, and considers his rule to be legitimate by legitimising the Jihād which is fought under his rule. How far indeed is this from what the Shī'ah claim that Jihād is not permissible till the emergence of the Mahdī¹ because of leadership being confined to the Twelve Imāms?

Furthermore, the Imāms would confess their crimes and they would seek the forgiveness of Allah *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى*.

Hence Amīr al-Mu'minīn would say the following in his supplication:

اللهم اغفر لي ما أنت أعلم به مني. فإن عدت فعد علي بالمغفرة. اللهم اغفر لي ما وأيت من نفسي ولم تجد له وفاء عندي. اللهم اغفر لي ما تقربت به إليك بلساني ثم خالفه قلبي. اللهم اغفر لي رمزات الألفاظ وسقطات الألفاظ وشهوات الجنان وهفوات اللسان.

O Allah forgive me for what you know best about me. If I happen to recommit my sins then forgive me again. O Allah forgive me for the promises I made to you which you found that I did not fulfil. O Allah forgive me for the words with which I sought your closeness but did not complement with the feelings of my heart. O Allah forgive me for the sneaky gazes, the mistakes of words, the desires of the bosom, and the slips of the tongue.²

In this narration you find the confession of sins, recommitting them after having repented, the confessions of the mistakes of speech, the desires of the bosom and the heart's opposition of the tongue... all of this debunks the infallibility that the Shī'ah claim. For if 'Alī *عليه السلام* and the Imāms were really infallible their seeking forgiveness would be in vein. It has thus been reported regarding all the Imāms that they sought the forgiveness of Allah from sins and shortfalls. Had they been infallible they would not have any sins whatsoever.

1 See chapter regarding occultation and the Mahdī: p. 1109 of this book.

2 *Nahj al-Balāghah* p. 104.

Abū ‘Abd Allah is reported to have said:

إنا لنذنب ونسيء ثم نتوب على الله متابا

We sin and do evil deeds and then we sincerely repent to Allah ¹ سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ

And Abū al-Hasan (Mūsā al-Kāẓim) would, according to the reports of the Shī‘ah, supplicate thus:

رب عصيتك بلساني ولو شئت وعزتك لأخرستني، وعصيتك ببصري بيدي ولو شئت وعزتك لكنعتني،
وعصيتك بفرجي ولو شئت وعزتك لأعقمتني، وعصيتك برجليي ولو شئت وعزتك لجذمتني، و
عصيتك بجميع جوارحي التي أنعمت بها علي ولم يكن هذا جزاك مني

O my Lord I disobeyed You with my tongue, if You wanted, by Your honour, You could have made me dumb. I disobeyed You with my eyes, if You wanted, by Your honour, You could have impaired my vision. I disobeyed You with my ears, if You wanted, by Your honour, You could have made me deaf. I disobeyed You with my hands, if You wanted, by Your honour, You could have paralysed me. I disobeyed You with my private parts, if You wanted You could have made me sterile. And I disobeyed You with my legs, if You want You could have amputated my legs. And I have disobeyed You with all the body parts You bestowed me with and did not repay You back for them adequately.²

These supplications and narrations have left the scholars of the Shī‘ah baffled due to them opposing their doctrine of infallibility.

One of them has sketched his confusion and bafflement around the aforementioned narration. He states:

كنت أفكر في معناه وأقول: كيف يتنزل علي ما تعتقد الشيعة من القول بالعصمة وما اتضح لي ما يدفع
التردد الذي يوجهه

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/207.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/203.

I was contemplating over the purport of this narration and saying, “How does this fit into what the Shī‘ah believe regarding infallibility?” And the answer which resolves this contention did not become clear to me.

Thereafter he mentions that he raised this contention to one of his scholars whose name is Raḍī al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Mūsā ibn Ṭā’ūs al-‘Alawī al-Ḥasanī. To which he responded by saying:

إن الوزير مؤيد الدين العلقي سألني عنه فقلت: كان يقول هذا ليعلم الناس

The minister Mu’ayyid al-Dīn al-‘Alqamī had previously asked me about the same. So I told him the following, “He would say this to educate the people.”

Ibn al-‘Alqamī was seemingly satisfied with the response. But the questioner furthered the question and raised the objection that:

إني فكرت بعد ذلك فقلت : هذا كان يقول في سجده في الليل وليس عنده من يعلمه

I thought about the answer thereafter and I said, “He would make this supplication at night when there was no one there who he could teach.”

He then says:

ثم خطر ببالي جواب آخر وهو أنه كان يقول ذلك علي سبيل التواضع

Another answer occurred to me. And that is that he would supplicate in this manner out of humility.

But he still was not satisfied and eventually concluded that the Imāms considered their permissible activities such as eating, drinking, and marriage, to be sins for which they would seek the forgiveness of Allah ﷻ. He then says that this is the definitive answer in this regard and hopes that Ibn al-‘Alqamī is alive so that he may guide him to this discovery and remove his bewilderment.¹

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/203-205.

But this answer, which he considers the definitive answer in this regard, is inharmonious with the Sharī'ah of Islam which prohibits a person from making that which is lawful unlawful and which denounces monasticism. Allah ﷻ says:

قُلْ مَنْ حَرَّمَ زِينَةَ اللَّهِ الَّتِي أَخْرَجَ لِعِبَادِهِ وَالطَّيِّبَاتِ مِنَ الرِّزْقِ

Say, "Who has forbidden the adornment of [i.e., from] Allah which He has produced for His servants and the good [lawful] things of provision?"¹

Why would the Imāms consider these activities to be unlawful; why would they consider marriage, which is one of the injunctions of Sharī'ah, a sin when Allah ﷻ says:

فَانكِحُوا مَا طَابَ لَكُمْ مِنَ النِّسَاءِ

Then marry those that please you of [other] women.²

Likewise, why would they consider eating and drinking unlawful when Allah ﷻ says:

كُلُوا مِنْ طَيِّبَاتِ مَا رَزَقْنَاكُمْ

Eat from the good things with which We have provided you.³

The only answer which can resolve this issue and is in harmony with the actual lives of the Imāms is that the doctrine of infallibility, as asserted by the Shī'ah, is baseless and that the Imāms are not protected from mistakes and sins. For as much as this is in accordance with the divine texts of Sharī'ah, it is also in

1 Sūrah al-A'rāf: 32.

2 Sūrah al-Nisā': 3.

3 Sūrah al-A'rāf: 160; Sūrah Tāhā: 81.

harmony with the actual lives of the Imāms. And only in this way would they serve as role models for their followers.

That is why the Ambiyā' عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ were ordinary humans who ate food and went to the market places, and strived for the propagation of the message of Allah ﷻ, underwent hardships at the hands of their people, and persevered the difficulties of this grave mission. All of this was so that they could serve as role models and so that they could pave the way and provide guidance for those to come after them.

Another point which invalidates the doctrine of infallibility from the books of the Shī'ah is the differences of opinion and the contradiction which the Imāms displayed regarding some issues. For the judgments and actions of the infallibles ought not be contradictory, rather they ought to compliment and support each other. Contradiction thus invalidates infallibility, which according to them is a provision for Imāmah, and by extension it invalidates Imāmah itself. This possibly, i.e. contradiction in the actions of the Imāms, was the reason owing to which many Shī'ah denounced Shī'ism. An example of this is the report documented by al-Qummī and al-Nawbakhtī regarding what had transpired after the martyrdom of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. It read as follows:

قتل الحسين حارت فرقة من أصحابه وقالت قد اختلف علينا فعل الحسن و فعل الحسين، لأنه إن كان الذي فعله الحسن حقا واجبا صوابا من موادعته معاوية و تسليمه له عند عجزه عن القيام بمحاربته مع كثرة أنصار الحسين و ضعفهم، و كثرة أصحاب يزيد حتي قتل و قتل أصحابه جميعا باطل غير واجب، لأن الحسين كان أعذر في العقود من محاربة يزيد و طلب الصلح و الموادعة من الحسن في القعود عن محاربة معاوية، و إن كان ما فعله الحسين حقا واجبا صوابا من مجاهدته يزيد حتي قتل و قتل ولده و أصحابه، فقعود الحسي و تركه مجاهدة معاوية و قتاله و معه العدد الكثير باكل، فشكو في إمامتهما رجعوا فدخلوا في مقالة العوام

After the martyrdom of Ḥusayn a faction of his followers disputed and said, "The stance of Ḥasan and the stance of Ḥusayn have confused us. For if the stance of Ḥasan regarding reconciling with Mu'āwiyah and relinquishing the Khilāfah when being unable to subdue him despite the multitudes of

supporters he had and their strength, is correct then the stance of Ḥusayn regarding opposing Yazīd to the extent where he and his comrades were killed is incorrect and unnecessary. Because Ḥusayn had more reason to reconcile with Yazīd and not initiate a rebellion against him than Ḥasan had when he chose not to oppose Mu'āwiyah. And if the stance of Ḥusayn regarding combatting Yazīd till he and his comrades were eventually martyred is correct, then the stance of Ḥasan regarding his reconciliation with Mu'āwiyah despite enjoying the support of multitudes of people is incorrect. They thus doubted the Imāmah of both of them and assimilated themselves with the general public.¹

As for their difference of opinions in jurisprudential issues, it is very vast and was also one of the causes for many of the Shī'ah detracting from Shī'ism. Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifāh al-Ṭūsī has attested to this and said that all their traditions are contradictory; to the extent that there is not a single report but that it is contradicted by another and there is not a single narration but that it is opposed by another. He has considered this to be the greatest flaws of the Shī'ī dogma and the reason for many of the Shī'ah detracting therefrom.²

The narrations of two of the seminal works of the Shī'ah, viz. *Al-Tahdhīb* and *Al-Istibṣār*, are the greatest testimony to this mammoth contradiction. Although al-Ṭūsī has tried to resolve this contradiction by stating that it was because of Taqiyyah, but he has just complicated it even more.

The Shī'ah have in order to camouflage the drastically disparate views of their Imāms, invented the doctrines of *Taqiyyah* and *Badā'*. One of the Shī'ah discovered this and thus forsook Shī'ism. He says:

إن إئمة الرافضة وضعوا لشيعتهم مقالتين لا يظهرون معهما من أثمتهم علي كذب أبدا وهما القول بالبداة وإجازة التقية.

1 Al-Qummī: *Al-Maḳālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 25; al-Nawbakhtī; *Firaq al-Shī'ah* p. 25-26.

2 See: p. 487 of this book.

The spearheaders of the Shī'ah have invented two ideas for their adherents owing to which they will never be able to discover any lie from their Imāms. They are: Badā' and the permissibility of Taqiyyah.¹

The books of the Shī'ah report that at times whilst seated in one gathering the Imām would give three different answers to the same question and he would justify this with the excuses of Taqiyyah, the freedom of the Imām in issuing a ruling and the flexibility of the Imām in stating a ruling with increase or decrease.

A person of the Shī'ah by the name 'Umar ibn Riyāḥ is reported to have went to the Imām to ask him a question. After the Imām gave him the ruling he went away and returned the next year and asked him the same question. This time the Imām gave him an answer different to the answer he had given him yesteryear. He was perplexed and said:

هذا خلاف ما أجبتني في هذه المسألة العام الماضي. فقال له أي الإمام: إن جوابنا خرج علي الثقة. فشككت في أمره وإمامته. ثم خرج من عنده ولقي أحد الشيعة (ويدعي محمد بن قيس) وقص عليه ما حدث وقال له: وقد والله علم الله أنني سألته عنها إلا وأنا صحيح العزم علي التدين بما يفتني به وقوله في العمل به، فلا وجه لانتقائه إياي وهذه حالي. فقال له محمد بن قيس: فلعلك حضرتك من انتقاء فقال: ما حضر مجلسه في واحده من المسألتين غيري ولكن جوابيه جميعا خرجا علي وجه التبخيت -كذا- ولم ما أجاب به في العام الماضي فيجب بمثله فرجع عن إمامته وقال: لا يكون إماما من يفتي بالباطل

"This is not the answer you had given me last year regarding the same issue."

To which the Imām replied, "I gave my answer by way of Taqiyyah."

This caused the person to doubt the Imām and his interactions. He thus left from there and met a Shī'ī by the name Muḥammad ibn Qays and told him of what had transpired and subsequently said, "Allah knows that I did

1 *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 78; *Firaq al-Shī'ah* p. 55-56. This person was Sulaymān ibn Jarīr who is the eponym of the Sulaymāniyyah, a sub-sect of the Zaydiyyah.

not ask him the question but with the sincere intention of practicing on the ruling he would give me. There was thus no reason for him to practice Taqiyyah in responding to me.”

Muḥammad ibn Qays said to him, “Possibly there was someone present who the Imām feared.”

He said, “No one was present besides me at both instances but it seems as if both the answers were given by way of estimation. Which is why he did not remember the answer he had given yesteryear and thus failed to give a similar answer (this year).”

He thus denounced the Imām and said, “A person who issues false rulings cannot be an Imām.”¹

Likewise al-Kulaynī has narrated the following from Zurārah ibn A‘yan regarding Abū Ja‘far:

سألته عن مسألة فأجبني ثم جاء رجل فسأله عنها فأجابه بخلاف ما أجبني ثم جاء رجل فسأله عنها فأجابه بخلاف ما أجبني وأجاب صاحبي فلما خرج الرجلان قلت: يا ابن رسول الله! رجلان من أهل العراق من شيعتكم قدما يسألان فأجبت كل واحد منهما بغير ما أجبته صاحبيه فقال: يا زرار! إن هذا خير لنا ولكم، ولو اجتمعتم علي أمر واحد لصدقكم الناس علينا ولكان أقل لبقائنا وبقائكم

I asked him regarding an issue for which he gave me an answer. Subsequently another person came and asked regarding the same, he gave him an answer different to the one he gave me. Thereafter a third person came who asked the same question, the Imām gave him an answer different to the ones he gave me and my friend.

Hence when the two men left I asked him, “O son of Rasūl Allah! Two men of Iraq who are your supporters came and asked the same question, but you gave each one of them an answer different to the answer you gave his two companions.”

1 *Firaq al-Shi‘ah* p. 59-61.

He said, “O Zurārah. This is best for us and for you. For if you were to unite upon common grounds the people would accept what you say over what we say and that would result in shortening our existence as well as yours.”¹

At times he is likewise reported to have given three different interpretations for one verse of the Qur’ān, and he justifies this by saying that the Imāms have been given the prerogative of interpreting the verse as they desire.²

You have noticed the different answers given in one gathering regarding one issue; this is inharmonious with infallibility.

All of this of course was based on the Shī‘ī perspective. Otherwise none of this had transpired. For it does not behove a man like Abū Ja‘far to issue a false ruling because of fear and by way Taqiyyah; his knowledge, piety and adherence to the dīn could not have allowed to do such. But these narrations are, however, the fabrication of those who invented the doctrine of infallibility in order to camouflage the discrepancies and contradictions which are the aftermath of their doings. Such contradictions which only suit their ignorance.

Lastly, their infallible Imām was unable to save them from arguing regarding Imāmah, the most crucial aspect of their dogma. Hence you will find that they dispute with one another, forsake one another, curse one another, and excommunicate one another due to their difference of opinion regarding the number of Imāms, their personalities, and the confusion of waiting for the return of the previous Imām or moving on to the follow the next. This is besides the many contradictory narrations pertaining to the various issues of dīn, comprising of both the fundamental and the secondary issues. Hence the alleged infallibility did not save them from dispute. The fact that it did not have any discernible impact on the Shī‘ah is a sign of it being non-existent.

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/65.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/265-266.

Having studied all of this, it is possible that the doctrine of infallibility was inherited by the Shī'ah from the Zoroastrians, because the Zoroastrians claim regarding their awaited leader and his companions that they will not lie, disobey Allah, or commit any minor or major sin.¹

In conclusion, someone might say that the doctrine of infallibility in today's world does not hold any importance due to the line of Imāms effectively ending in the year 260 A.H. All that remains is the appearance of the alleged promised Mahdī.

I say that this doctrine still has its impact in the Shī'ī world today and it represents itself in various ways:

1. Their adherence to what is narrated from their Imāms as diligently as the Muslims adhere to the Qur'ān and the Sunnah.
2. Their extremism and exaggerations at the graves and shrines of the Imāms. For their extremism in asserting the infallibility of the Imāms has led them to ascribing divine attributes to them which has translated into exaggeration at their graves and shrines which they circumambulate and wherefrom they seek help.
3. The Shī'ī Mujtahid in Shī'ī circles enjoys a portion of infallibility. For they consider the one who rejects his teachings equal to the one who rejects Allah. At times it reaches the level of ascribing partners to Allah *شُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى*.² This is a very grave matter because it is the Shī'ī scholars who are in charge of affairs today in the Shī'ī country. Hence the people carry out their teachings as if they are revealed by Allah and they do not fear falling into polytheism by doing so.
4. Believing in this doctrine and living by it.

1 *Tathbīt Dalā'il al-Nubuwwah* 1/179.

2 Some of their texts in this regard will be cited in the section of occultation and the Mahdī *In Shā Allah*.

Chapter Three

Taqiyyah (dissimulation)¹

The Definition of Taqiyyah

Al-Mufīd gives the following definition of Taqiyyah:

التقية كتمان الحق، و ستر الاعتقاد فيه، و كتمان المخالفين، و ترك مظاهرتهم بما يعقب ضررا في الدين أو الدنيا

Taqiyyah is concealing the truth, discreetly believing in it, not disclosing it in front of the opposition and not confronting them in a way which will bring about harm to person in worldly or religious matters.²

1 The verb اتَّقَى means to exercise caution (*Lisān al-'Arab*: under the root letters وقى). Ibn Ḥajr therefore says:

الحذر من إظهار ما في النفس من معتقد وغيره للغير

Taqiyyah is concealing that which is in the heart, i.e. beliefs and everything besides it. (*Faṭḥ al-Bārī* 12/314)

This means to hide the truth. And at times a person is compelled to say with his tongue that which is not in his heart. Ibn 'Abbās رضي الله عنه says:

التقية باللسان والقلب مطمئن بالإيمان

Taqiyyah is with the tongue whilst the heart is still content upon īmān.

And Abū al-'Āliyah says:

التقية باللسان وليس بالعمل

Taqiyyah is linked with the tongue; it has nothing to do with practice. (*Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī*, with the revision of Shākir 6/314-315; *Faṭḥ al-Bārī* 12/314).

So Taqiyyah in essence means expressing that which is contrary to what is in heart (See: Ibn Athīr: *Al-Nihāyah* 1/193). And majority of the Arabs use the word Tuqāt instead of Taqiyyah. That is why in the Qur'ān the verse of Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 28 also contains the word Tuqāt. But to pronounce it as Taqiyyah is also correct, as asserted by al-Farrā', for it does reads as Taqiyyah as well according to another dialect (see: al-Farrā': *Ma'ānī al-Qur'ān* p. 205; *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 6/317).

2 *Sharḥ 'Aqā'id al-Ṣadūq* (it is published jointly with *Awā'il al-Maqālāt*) p. 261.

Al-Mufid defines Taqiyyah as concealing the truth out of fear from the opposition who are the Ahl al-Sunnah, as is apparent from their frequent usage of the word ‘opposition’ for them. In other words, it is expressing the religion of the Ahl al-Sunnah which they consider baseless and concealing the dogma of the Shī‘ah which they consider the truth. Based on this some scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah have asserted that the Shī‘ah are worse than the hypocrites, because the hypocrites inwardly know that the disbelief that they believe in is false but they express Islam out of fear. As for these people, they inwardly believe their dogma to be the truth and that it is in harmony with the ways of prophets and Imāms.¹

Taqiyyah in Islam is practiced against the disbelievers. Allah ﷻ says:

إِلَّا أَنْ تَتَّقُوا مِنْهُمْ تُقَاةً

Except when taking precaution against them in prudence.²

Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī says:

التقية التي ذكرها الله في هذه الآية إنما هي تقية من الكفار لا من غيرهم

The Taqiyyah which Allah ﷻ has mentioned in this verse is against the disbelievers, not anyone else.³

That is why some scholars are of the opinion that it became impermissible to practice Taqiyyah after Allah ﷻ had made Islam victorious. Mu‘ādh ibn Jabal and Mujāhid say:

كانت التقية في جدة الإسلام قبل قوة المسلمين، أما اليوم فقد أعز الله المسلمين أن يتقوا منهم تقاة

Taqiyyah was practiced in the initial stages of Islam before it had gained

1 Ibn Taymiyyah: *Risālah fī ‘Ilm al-Zāhir wa al-Bāṭin* (as part of *Majmū‘ah al-Rasā’il al-Muniriyyah*) 1/248.

2 Sūrāh Āl ‘Imrān: 28

3 *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 6/316.

strength. As for today, Allah ﷻ has given glory to Islam thus leaving no need for them to practice Taqiyyah.¹

But the Shī'ah practice Taqiyyah with the Muslims, in general, and with the Ahl al-Sunnah in specific. To the extent that they consider the golden era of Islam to be the era of Taqiyyah, as is asserted by al-Mufīd² and as is easily understood from the many narrations which they attribute to the Imāms. As they consider the Ahl al-Sunnah worse than the Jews and the Christians in their disbelief due to the denial of Imāmah according to them being worse than the denial of prophethood.³

Taqiyyah is only permitted in situations of complete desperation. That is why Allah ﷻ has excluded it from the prohibition of befriending the disbelievers. He says:

لَا يَتَّخِذِ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ الْكَافِرِينَ أَوْلِيَاءَ مِنْ دُونِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَمَنْ يَفْعَلْ ذَلِكَ فَلَيْسَ مِنَ اللَّهِ فِي شَيْءٍ إِلَّا أَنْ تَتَّقُوا مِنْهُمْ تُقَاةً وَيَحْذَرُكُمُ اللَّهُ نَفْسَهُ وَإِلَى اللَّهِ الْمَصِيرُ

Let not believers take disbelievers as allies [i.e., supporters or protectors] rather than believers. And whoever [of you] does that has nothing [i.e., no association] with Allah, except when taking precaution against them in prudence. And Allah warns you of Himself, and to Allah is the [final] destination.⁴

Allah ﷻ has prohibited us from befriending the disbelievers and has sounded a very serious warning for those who do so. He says:

وَمَنْ يَفْعَلْ ذَلِكَ فَلَيْسَ مِنَ اللَّهِ فِي شَيْءٍ

1 *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 4/57; al-Shawkānī: *Fath al-Qadīr* 1/331.

2 This has passed on p. 59 of this book.

3 See p. 967 onwards of this book.

4 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 28.

Meaning a person who does that which Allah ﷻ has prohibited in this regard has indeed freed himself of his relationship with Allah. Thereafter Allah ﷻ says:

إِلَّا أَنْ تَتَّقُوا مِنْهُمْ تُقَاةً

Meaning with the exception of the person who in some places and at sometimes fears their evil, for it is permissible for him to exercise Taqiyyah outwardly but not inwardly and intentionally.¹

Likewise the scholars all unanimously concur that Taqiyyah is only to be practiced in times of desperation. Ibn al-Mundhir says:

أجمعوا علي أن من أكره علي الكفر حتي خشي علي نفسه القتل فكفر و قلبه مطمئن بالإيمان أنه لا يحكم عليه بالكفر

They have agreed that the ruling of disbelief will not be passed against a person who outwardly utters the words of disbelief when he is coerced in a way that he fears murder upon himself, as long as his heart in content upon īmān.²

However a person who sticks to the ideal at this juncture he is better. Ibn Baṭṭāl says:

و أجمعوا علي أن من أكره علي الكفر واختار القتل أنه أعظم أجرا عند الله

They have agreed that a person who is coerced to utter the words of disbelief and chooses murder will attain more reward from Allah ﷻ.³

1 *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 1/371. Refer to other Tafsīrs also and see the commentary of the verses: Āl ‘Imrān: 28 and al-Naḥl: 106.

2 *Faṭḥ al-Bārī* 12/314.

3 *Ibid*: 12/317.

However the Taqiyyah that the Shī'ah practice is very different. For it is not just a concession but it is one of the fundamentals of their dogma, like that of ṣalāh or even greater. Ibn Bābawayh says:

اعتقادنا في التقية أنها واجبة من تركها بمنزلة من ترك الصلاة

Our belief regarding Taqiyyah is that it is compulsory. A person who leaves it is like a person who leaves ṣalāh.¹

Al-Ṣādiq is reported to have said:

لو قلت أن تارك التقية كتارك الصلاة لكنت صادقا

If I were to say that the person who abandons Taqiyyah is like a person who abandons ṣalāh I would be speaking the truth.²

They in fact attribute this to Rasūl Allah ﷺ. They say that he said:

تارك التقية كتارك الصلاة

A person who abandons Taqiyyah is like a person who abandons ṣalāh.³

They have further elevated it from just being a fundamental to being nine tenths of dīn. And taking it further, they assert that Taqiyyah itself is complete dīn; so a person who does not practice Taqiyyah has no dīn. The following narration appears in *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*:

إن تسعة أعشار الدين في التقية ولا دين لمن لا تقية له

1 *Al-I'tiqādāt* p. 114.

2 Ibn Idrīs: *al-Sarā'ir* p. 479; Ibn Bābawayh: *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh* 2/80; *Jāmi' al-Akḥbār* p. 110; al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī: *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 7/94; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 75/412-414.

3 *Jāmi' al-Akḥbār* p. 110; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 75/412.

Ja'far ibn Muḥammad said, "Nine tenths of dīn are in Taqiyyah. And there is no dīn for a person who does not practice Taqiyyah."¹

They have considered not practicing Taqiyyah a sin equivalent to ascribing partners with Allah **سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى** which cannot be forgiven. Their narrations mention:

يغفر الله للمؤمن كل ذنب، يظهر منه في الدنيا والآخرة، ما خلا ذنبين: ترك التقية، وتضييع حقوق الإخوان

Allah will forgive every sin of a believer which he commits in this world and in the hereafter, besides two sins: forsaking Taqiyyah and not fulfilling the rights of the brothers.²

Whereas Taqiyyah in Islam which is a dīn of striving and propagation cannot be the default decorum of a Muslim. Nor can it be one of the salient features of a Muslim society. Instead it is more a time-confined concession based on a person's personal situation of desperation and the inability to migrate which later falls away with the passage of the period of coercion.

Conversely, according to the Shī'ī perspective it is considered to be the very basis of their structure. Abū 'Abd Allah says:

إنكم علي دين من كتمه أعزه الله، ومن أذاعه أذله الله

You are upon a dīn, whoever conceals it Allah will elevate him. And whoever propagates it Allah will disgrace him.³

He is also reported to have said:

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/217; al-Barqī: *al-Maḥāsīn* p. 259; al-Ḥurr al-Āmilī: *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 11/460; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 75/423.

2 *Tafsīr al-Ḥasan al-'Askarī* p. 130; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 11/474; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 75/415.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/222.

...أبي الله-عز و جل- لنا ولكم في دينه إلا التقية

Allah ﷻ is not pleased for us in our dīn with anything else besides Taqiyyah¹

So Taqiyyah according to them is a continuous practice which forms part of the social ethos of the community. Ibn Bābawayh has mentioned the following in his book *Al-I'tiqādāt* (which is also known as *The Dogma of the Imāmiyyah*):

والتقية واجبة لا يجوز رفعها إلي أن يخرج القائم، فمن تركها قبل خروجه فقد خرج عن دين الله -تعالى-
وعن دين الإمامية وخالف الله ورسوله والأئمة

Taqiyyah is compulsory; it is not permissible to abandon it till the emergence of the Mahdī. Whoever abandons it before his emergence has left the dīn of Allah and the creed of the Imāmiyyah. He has likewise opposed Allah, his Rasūl and the Imāms.²

Likewise the books of the Shī'ah narrate the following from 'Alī ibn Mūsā al-Riḍā:

لا إيمان لمن لا تقية له، وإن أكرمكم عند الله أعلمكم بالتقية فقل له: يابن رسول الله إلي متى؟ قال: إلي يوم الوقت المعلوم وهو يوم خروج قائمنا فمن ترك التقية قبل خروج قائمنا فليس منا.

There is no faith for a person who does not practice Taqiyyah. And the most honourable among you is the one who practices Taqiyyah the most.³

He was asked, "Till when, O son of Rasūl Allah?"

He replied, "Till the day of the specified time, i.e. the day of the emergence of our Mahdī. Hence a person who abandons Taqiyyah before the emergence of the Mahdī is not from amongst us."⁴

1 Ibid. 2/218.

2 *Al-I'tiqādāt* p. 114-115.

3 It is as if they interpret the verse: إِنَّ أَكْرَمَكُمْ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ أَتْقَاهُمْ (al-Hujurāt: 13)

4 Ibn Bābawayh: *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 355; al-Ṭabarsī: *A'lām al-Warā* p. 408; Abū al-Qāsim al-Rāzī: *Kifāyah al-Athar* p. 323; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 11/465-466. Also see: *Jāmi' al-Akhbār* p. 110; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 75/412.

Furthermore, Taqiyyah is inseparable from the Shī'ah in all the Muslim lands. To the extent that they call the *Dār al-Islam*, Muslim state, 'the abode of Taqiyyah'. It is mentioned in their narrations that:

والتقية في دار التقية واجبة

And Taqiyyah in the Taqiyyah abode is compulsory.¹

They also call it the 'abode of falsehood'. They say:

من كان يؤمن بالله واليوم الآخر فلا يتكلم في دولة الباطل إلا بالتقية

That person who believes in Allah and the last day should not talk in the abode of falsehood but by way of Taqiyyah.²

They also call it 'the abode of the oppressors'. They say:

التقية فريضة واجبة علينا في دولة الظالمين، فمن تركها فقد خالف دين الإمامية و فارقه

Taqiyyah is mandatory upon us in the abode of the oppressors. Whoever does not practice it has opposed the dīn of the Imāmiyyah and denounced it.³

They also emphasise that the interactions between the Shī'ah and the Ahl al-Sunnah should be purely based on Taqiyyah. Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī has actually established a chapter by the title, *Chapter regarding the interactions with the commonality (Ahl al-Sunnah) being compulsory by way of Taqiyyah*.⁴

In this regard, they have attributed the following to Abū 'Abd Allah:

1 *Jāmi' al-Akḥbār* p. 110; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 75/411.

2 *Jāmi' al-Akḥbār* p. 110; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 75/412.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 75/421.

4 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 11/470.

من صلي معهم في الصف الأول فكأنما صلي مع رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم في صف الأول

A person who reads ṣalāh with them in the first row is like a person who read ṣalāh with Rasūl Allah ﷺ in the first row.¹

Likewise:

من صلي خلف المنافقين بتقية كان كمن صلي خلف الأئمة

A person who performs ṣalāh behind the hypocrites by way of Taqiyyah is like a person who reads ṣalāh behind the Imāms.²

And the author of *Kashf al-Ghiṭā'* says:

التقية إذا وجبت فمتي أتى بالعبادة علي خلافها بطلت، وقد ورد فيها الحث العظيم، و أنها من دين آل محمد وأن من لا تقية له لا إيمان له

Taqiyyah is compulsory. So when a person carries out a good deed without it, it is void of acceptance. There is a lot of encouragement regarding it in the narrations. Likewise it is mentioned that it is from the dīn of Muḥammad and that there is no īmān for a person who does not practice Taqiyyah.³

Taking it a step ahead, Taqiyyah is compulsory even though there might not be a valid reason for it. Hence their narrations encourage a person to practice Taqiyyah even with those whom they feel safe so that by frequently practicing it, it becomes part of their disposition and nature. Which will then make it easier to practice it without any formalities with those who they sense a threat from and who they fear. Their books narrate:

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 75/421.

2 *Jāmi' al-Akḥbār* p. 110; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 75/412.

3 Ja'far al-Najafī: *Kashf al-Ghiṭā'* p. 61.

عليكم بالتقية فإنه ليس منا من لم يجعلها شعاره ودثاره مع من يأمنه، لتكون سجيته مع من يحذره

You should firmly hold on to Taqiyyah. For that person who does not make it his inner and outer covering with those who he does not fear till it becomes his usual style of interaction with those who he fears, is not from us.¹

Taqiyyah, of course, when practiced in this manner is nothing but lies and hypocrisy through and through. And it is despised by people of sound disposition and upright character; it is not worth acceptance according to the people of intellect. The narrations of the Shī'ah, therefore, induce them to live by it by trying to make it plausible. Hence they suggest that it is the 'Ibādāh (worship) of Allah, rather the most beloved of acts of worships to him. Al-Kulaynī narrates:

عن هشام الكندي قال: سمعت أبا عبد الله يقول: والله ما عبد الله بشيء أحب إليه من الخبء، فقلت :
ما الخبء؟ قال: التقية

Hishām al-Kindī says, "I heard Abū 'Abd Allah saying, 'By Allah! Allah cannot be worshipped in any way which is more beloved to him than Khab.'

I asked him, 'What is Khab?'

He said, 'It is Taqiyyah.'"²

The following narration similarly appears in *al-Kāfī* and other books:

عن محمد بن مروان عن أبي عبد الله رضي الله عنه قال: كان أبي عليه السلام يقول: و أي شيء أقر لعيني
من التقية

Muḥammad ibn Marwān narrates from Abū 'Abd Allah, "My father would often say, 'Is there anything more soothing to my eyes than Taqiyyah.'"³

1 Amālī al-Ṭūsī 1/199; Wasā'il al-Shī'ah 11/466; Biḥār al-Anwār 75/395.

2 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/219. See also: Ibn Bābawayh: Ma'ānī al-Akhbār p. 162; Wasā'il al-Shī'ah 11/462.

3 Uṣūl al-Kāfī 2/220.

Likewise another narration mentions:

ما خلق الله شيئاً أقر لعين أبيك من التقية

Allah has not created anything more soothing to the eyes of your father than Taqiyyah.¹

These are the characteristics of Taqiyyah according to the Twelvers. The author of *al-Kāfī* has produced all the narrations in this regard under the chapters of Taqiyyah,² *Kitmān* (concealing),³ and *Idhā'ah* (spreading).⁴

And al-Majlisī has produced a hundred and nine narrations in his *Biḥār* in the chapter, *Chapter regarding Taqiyyah and affability*.⁵

As to this exaggeration in the issue of Taqiyyah, it is the result of many reasons. Some being the following:

Firstly, the Shī'ah consider the rule of the first three Khulafā' to be illegitimate. They consider them and those who pledged allegiance to them disbelievers. Notwithstanding that 'Alī عليه السلام pledged his allegiance to them, read ṣalāh behind them, fought alongside them, established marital relations with them, and received concubines as booty after their Jihāds. And when he assumed rulership he treaded their path and did not make any changes to the institutions put in place by Abū Bakr and 'Umar عليه السلام, as is attested to in the books of the Shī'ah themselves.⁶ This extirpates the Shī'ī dogma from its very roots. They thus endeavoured to find a way out of this apparent contradiction which poses a threat to them by inventing the doctrine of Taqiyyah.

1 Ibn Bābawayh: *al-Khiṣāl* p. 22; *Jāmi'* *al-Akhbār* p. 110; al-Barqī: *al-Maḥāsīn* p. 258; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 11/460-464; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 75/394.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/217.

3 Ibid. 2/221.

4 Ibid. 2/369.

5 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 75/393-443.

6 See p. 566 of this book.

Secondly, they claim that the Imāms are infallible and that they are not overcome by heedlessness, mistakes or forgetfulness. This claim is in stark contrast with what is known about the Imāms. To the extent that the traditions of the Shī'ah conflict one another; so much so that there is not a single narration but that it is opposed by another, as is attested to by their scholar al-Ṭūsī.¹

This also violates the doctrine of infallibility. Hence they invented the idea of Taqiyyah in order to justify the apparent conflict and contradiction. The author of *al-Kāfī* narrates the following from Maṣṣūr ibn Ḥāzim:

قلت لأبي عبد الله -عليه السلام- ما بالي أسألك عن المسألة فتجيبني فيها بالجواب، ثم يجيبك غيري فتجيبه فيها بجواب آخر؟ فقال: إنا نجيب الناس علي الزيادة والنقصان

I asked Abū 'Abd Allah, "Why is it that when I ask you a question you give me an answer and when someone else asks you the same questions you give him a different answer?"

He replied, "I answer to people with increase and decrease."²

The commentator of *al-Kāfī* comments on this narration:

أي زيادة حكم عند التقية، و نقصانه عند عدمها... ولم يكن ذلك مستندا إلى النسيان والجهل بل لعلمهم بأن اختلاف كلمتهم أصلح لهم، وأنفع لبقائهم إذ لو اتفقوا بالشييع وصار ذلك سببا لقتلهم، وقتل الأئمة عليهم السلام

I.e. with increase when practicing Taqiyyah and with decrease when not practicing it. It was not because of forgetfulness or ignorance. Rather it was because they knew that their variant answers were better for them and more effective in their prolonged existence. For if they were to agree they would have become associated with Shī'ism which subsequently would be the cause of their murder and the murder of the Imāms.³

1 See p. 487 of this book.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/65.

3 *Al-Māzindarānī: Sharḥ al-jāmi'* 2/397.

It is for this reason that Sulaymān ibn Jarīr al-Zaydī considered Taqiyyah to be a cover up for the differences and contradictions. Hence when they noticed the Imāms giving different answers for the same question and at times the same answer for different questions, the Imāms said to them:¹

إنما أجبنا بهذا للتقية، ولنا أن نجيب بما أجبنا و كيف شئنا، لأن ذلك إلينا، ونحن نعلم بما يصلحكم، وما فيه بقاءنا و بقاءكم، و كف عدوكم عنا وعنكم،

We have given this answer on the basis of Taqiyyah. And we have the prerogative to answer however we want and with whatever we want. Because we have been given this authority. And we know what is more suited for you and what is more effective for our existence and yours and what will avert your enemy from us and from you.

He thus says:

قال: فممتي يظهر من هؤلاء علي كذب، وممتي يعرف لهم حق من باطل

So when will a person then come to know of any lie from them and how will he ever be able to differentiate between the truth and falsehood.²

Thirdly, the doctrine of Taqiyyah was invented in order to facilitate the easy accomplishment of the agenda of the liars and in order to cloud the actual religion of the Ahl al-Bayt. This is by giving the followers the impression that whatever they (the inventors of Taqiyyah) report from them is their actual religion and that whatever is well-known about them, or whatever they say and do in front of the general Muslims does not represent their actual religion due to them just doing that by way of Taqiyyah. Hence in this way it would become very easy for them to reject the verdicts of the Imāms, manipulate them, and belie the truth which is narrated from them. Hence you will find that they reject the verdicts of Muḥammad al-Bāqir and Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq which they said in front of the people

1 Based on what their evil scholars narrate from them.

2 *Al-Maḡālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 78; al-Nawbakhtī: *Firaq al-Shī‘ah* p. 65-66.

or which the reliable transmitters of Sharī'ah transmit from them by merely alleging that they were practicing Taqiyyah because of the presence of a Sunnī. And conversely, they accept the narrations which inveterate liars like Jābir al-Ju'fī and his like narrate from them asserting that there was no one present because of who he had to practice Taqiyyah.

In this regard it is sufficient to note that Imām Zayd ibn 'Alī who is a member of the Ahl al-Bayt narrated from 'Alī عليه السلام that he would wash his feet in Wuḍū', as is narrated in the books of the Twelvers themselves. But Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifāh al-Ṭūsī refused to accept this narration and has no valid reason to reject it besides Taqiyyah. Hence he narrates the narration Zayd ibn 'Alī narrates from his grandfather 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib in his book *Al-Istibṣār*:

جلست أتوضأ فأقبل رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم حين ابتدأت الوضوء -إلي أن قال - و غسلت قدمي، فقال لي يا علي خلل بين الأصبع لا تخلل بالنار

"I set to perform Wuḍū' and when I started it Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم came." Till he said, "And I washed my feet."

So he told me, "O 'Alī! Make *Khilāl* of your toes (pass a wet hand through them) so that they are not afflicted with the fire of Jahannam."¹

As you can see, 'Alī عليه السلام would wash his feet in Wuḍū' and Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم pressed upon him to make *Khilāl* of his toes, but the Shī'ah oppose this Sunnah of Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم and his practice in this regard. They do not pay any attention to these narrations despite them appearing in their books and being narrated from their Imāms. Their scholars do not want to burden themselves to investigate these narrations and study them due to their ever ready and universal answer of Taqiyyah. Therefore, Al-Ṭūsī, after citing it, says:

هذا خبر موافق للعامة (يعني أهل السنة) وقد ورد مورد التقية لأن المعلوم الذي لا يتخالج منه الشك من مذاهب أئمتنا عليهم السلام القول بالمسح علي الرجلين.

1 *Al-Istibṣār* 1/65-66.

This narration is in harmony with the practice of the commonality (the Ahl al-Sunnah). It was said by way of Taqiyyah. This is because it is undoubtedly the unanimous stance of all our Imāms to make *Masaḥ* of the feet (pass a wet hand over them).¹

He further says:

إن رواية هذا الخبر كلهم عامة ورجال الزيدية. وما يختصون به لا يعمل به

The narrators of this narration are all from the commonality (the Ahl al-Sunnah) and the Zaydiyyah. And whatever they exclusively narrate is not worth practicing.

He likewise documents a narration of washing the feet from Abū ‘Abd Allah Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq and interprets it to be by way of Taqiyyah.²

Likewise he also interprets the narrations of Adhān which are not harmonious with their stance to have been said by way of Taqiyyah.³

Similarly in issues of inheritance they assert that a woman will not inherit properties, houses and lands at all.⁴ And when they are confronted with a narration which is narrated from their Imāms which opposes this, they say that it was said by way of Taqiyyah. Abū Ya‘fūr narrates that he asked Abū ‘Abd Allah the following:

سألته عن الرجل هل يرث من دار امرأته أو أرضها من التربة شيئا؟ أو يكون في ذلك منزلة المرأة فلا يرث من ذلك شيئا؟ فقال: يرثها و ترثه من كل شيء ترك و تركت

1 *Al-Istibṣār* 1/65-66.

2 *Ibid*: 1/65.

3 *Ibid*. 1/308. (For example: the narration which states that he should say *الصلوة خير من النوم* (Ṣalāh is better than sleep) in the Fajr Adhān.

4 *Al-Istibṣār*: Chapter regarding a woman not inheriting anything of properties and houses: 4/151-155.

I asked him regarding a man. Can he inherit a share from his wife's house or her land, or is that specifically the ownership of the wife wherein the husband has no share?

He said, "He will inherit from her and she will inherit from him anything that he or she has left behind."¹

Al-Ṭūsī whilst commenting on this narration says:

نحمله علي التقية، لأن جميع من خالفنا يخالف في هذه المسألة، وليس يوافقنا عليها أحد من العامة، وما يجري هذا المجرى يجوز التقية

We interpret this narration to be by way of Taqiyyah. Because all our opponents oppose us in this issue; no one is in harmony with us. And usually when this is the case in any issue it is permissible to practice Taqiyyah when mentioning it.²

Regarding marriage as well, there are many narrations which prohibit *Mut'ah* (temporary marriages). It is narrated in their books that Zayd ibn 'Alī narrates from his fathers who narrate from 'Alī that Rasūl Allah ﷺ prohibited consuming the meat of donkeys and *Mut'ah* one the day of Khaybar.³

Their scholar al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī say the following about this narration:

أقول حملة الشيخ و غيره علي التقية يعني في الرواية، لأن إباحة المتعة من ضروريات مذهب الإمامية

I say that Shaykh⁴ has considered this to have been said by way of Taqiyyah, because the permissibility of *Mut'ah* is one of the salient features of our dogma.⁵

1 Ibid: 4/154.

2 Ibid. 4/155.

3 Al-Ṭūsī: *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* 2/184; *Al-Istibṣār* 3/132; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 7/441.

4 When Shaykh is said in the Shī'ī books al-Ṭūsī is meant.

5 *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 7/441.

Fourthly, the doctrine of Taqiyyah has been invented to keep the Shī'ah aloof from the Muslims. Their narrations prove this. Hence their Imām Abū 'Abd Allah is reported to have said”

ما سمعت مني يشبه قول الناس فيه التقية، وما سمعت مني لا يشبه قول الناس فلا تقية فيه

Whatever you hear me say that is in accordance with the views of people is by way of Taqiyyah, and whatever you hear me say that does not resemble the views of the people is not by way of Taqiyyah.¹

This is a very grave stance, for it takes the Shī'ah out of the fold of Islam and includes them in the rank of the heretics and apostates. This is because they have made the opposition of the Muslims their principles and that necessarily implies that they agree with the disbelievers and disagree with the believers. See to what extent the heretics of the past centuries have manipulated them.

One of the results of the doctrine of Taqiyyah is that the Shī'ah have lost the true religion of their Imāms due to them not being able to differentiate what was said by way of Taqiyyah and what was not.² It likewise gave birth to a principle which is entirely based on extremism, i.e. whatever opposes the commonality entails guidance.³

The author of *al-Ḥadā'iq* has conceded that very little of the actual religion of the Imāms is known because of the practice of Taqiyyah. He says:

فلم يعلم من أحكام الدين علي اليقين إلا القليل لا متزاج أخباره بأخبار التقية، كما قد اعترف بذلك ثقة الإسلام محمد بن يعقوب الكليني في جامع الكافي حتي أنه تخطأ العمل بالترجيحات المروية عند تعارض الأخبار والتجأ إلي مجرد الرد والتسليم للأئمة الأبرار

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 2/252. (with reference to *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*)

2 See the arguments al-Suwaydī presents in this regard against the Shī'ah and their inability to answer him (*Mu'tamar al-Najaf* p. 106).

3 Refer back to the section of their stance regarding the consensus of the Ummah.

From the rulings of dīn none but a few are known with certainty because of their reports being mixed with the reports of Taqiyyah. *Thiqat al-Islam* al-Kulaynī has conceded this in his book *al-Kāfi*. To the extent that he considers practicing upon the narrations which are preferred over those which contradict them incorrect, and he resorts to merely submitting himself to the righteous Imāms.¹

Furthermore, when it comes to the application of Taqiyyah, it is completely clear that it is not a concession for times of dire need and desperation. Hence the author of *al-Ḥadā'iq* also concedes the following:

يخالفون بين الأحكام وإن لم يحضرهم أحد من أولئك الأئمة، فتراهم يجيبون في المسألة الواحدة بأجوبة متعددة، وإن لم يكن بها قائل من المخالفين

They give conflicting rulings even though none of those people (the Sunnīs) are present. Hence you will find them giving various answers regarding one particular issue even when none of the opposition is present with them.²

The examples which demonstrate this are copious.

Al-Kulaynī narrates the following:

عن موسى بن أشيم قال: كنت عند أبي عبد الله فسأله رجل عن آية من كتاب الله - عز وجل - فأخبره بها، ثم دخل عليه داخل فسأله عن تلك الآية فأخبره بخلاف ما أخبر به الأول، قال: فدخلني من ذلك ما شاء الله حتي كأن قلبي يشرح بالسكاكين فقلت في نفسي: تركت أبا قتادة بالشام لا يخطيء في الواو و شبيهه، وجئت إلي هذا يخطيء هذا الخطأ كله فبينما أنا كذلك إذ دخل عليه آخر فسأله عن تلك الآية فأخبره بخلاف ما أخبرني وأخبر صاحبي، فسكنت نفسي فعلمت أن ذلك منه تقية، قال: ثم التفت إلي فقال لي: يا ابن أشيم إن الله فوض إلي نبيه فقال: وَمَا آتَاكُمُ الرَّسُولُ فَخُذُوهُ وَمَا نَهَاكُمْ عَنْهُ فَانْتَهُوا فما فوض إلي رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم فقد فوضه إلينا

1 Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī: *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Nādirah* 1/5.

2 Ibid.

Mūsā ibn Ashyam says, “I was in the presence of Abū ‘Abd Allah. One person asked him regarding a verse of the Qur’ān. He informed him about it. Thereafter another person came and asked regarding the same and he gave an answer different to the one he gave the first person.”

He further says, “That which Allah ﷻ intended entered my heart and I felt as if my heart was being cut with knives. I said to myself, ‘I left Abū Qatādah in Syria who does not make a mistake in even a Waw (the alphabet و) and its likes and came to this person who makes such grave blunders. Whilst I was still grappling with this another person came and asked him regarding the same verse and he gave him an answer different to the answers he had given me and my friend. My heart was immediately at ease and I knew that he was answering by way of Taqiyyah. He then turned to me and said, “Allah ﷻ gave his Nabī authority and said, ‘And whatever the Messenger has given you – take; and what he has forbidden you – refrain from’. So whatever authority he was given we are also given.”¹

See how they attribute leading people astray with incorrect interpretations and the propagation of reprehensible interpretations of the Qur’ān to Ja’far. And then they still claim that dīn was his prerogative which he could temper with it as he desired. This is not Taqiyyah, this is rather heterodoxy and being an obstacle for others to enter the dīn of Allah ﷻ. Was there any need for Taqiyyah when interpreting the Qur’ān in the best of eras and that also from a scholar of the Ahl al-Bayt?

They also claim that their Imāms would issue rulings of impermissible things being permissible and vice versa due to practicing Taqiyyah without any valid reason. Hence in *al-Kāfī* the following narrations appears:

عن أبان بن تغلب قال: سمعت أبا عبد الله يقول: كان أبي عليه السلام يقني في زمن بني أمية أن ما قتل البازي والصفر فهو حلال وكان يتقيهم. وأنا لا أتقيهم وهو حرام ما قتل

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/265-266.

Abān ibn Taghlib mentions that he heard Abū ‘Abd Allah saying, “My father would in the era of the Umayyads issue the ruling that whatever is hunted with falcons and vultures is permissible to consume. He would issue this ruling by way of Taqiyyah. I do not fear them (and thus do not have to practice Taqiyyah) and thus I say that whatever they hunt is impermissible.”¹

One of the clearest evidences of the fact that Taqiyyah is not but blatant unjustified lies is the narration which al-Kulaynī narrates from Muḥammad ibn Muslim. He says:

دخلت علي أبي عبد الله عليه السلام (جعفر الصادق) وعنده أبو حنيفة. فقلت له: جعلت فداك رأيت رؤيا عجيبة. فقال لي يا بن مسلم! هاتها إن العالم بها جالس وأوماً بيده إلي أبي حنيفة. (فعرض الراوي الرؤيا علي أبي حنيفة فأجابه أبو حنيفة عليها- كما يزعمون) فقال أبو عبد الله عليه السلام: أصبت والله يا أبا حنيفة. قال (الراوي) ثم خرج أبو حنيفة من عنده فقلت له: جعلت فداك إني كرهت تعبير هذا الناصب. فقال: يا بن مسلم! لا يسؤك الله فما يواطئ تعبيرهم تعبیرنا ولا تعبیرنا تعبيرهم وليس التعبير كما عبره. قال: فقلت له: جعلت فداك: فقولك: أصبت وتحلف عليه وهو مخطئ؟ قال نعم حلفت عليه أنه أصاب الخطأ.

I went to Abū ‘Abd Allah and Abū Ḥanīfah was present by him.

I asked him, “May I be sacrificed for thee. I have seen a very strange dream.”

He said to me, “O son of Muslim! Mention it for the knower of its interpretation is seated here.”

And he indicated towards Abū Ḥanīfah. (Thereafter the narrator presents his dream to Abū Ḥanīfah and he provides an answer, as they allege).

Thereupon Abū ‘Abd Allah said, “O Abū Ḥanīfah surely you answered accurately.”

The narrator says that subsequent to that Abū Ḥanīfah left whereupon I said to the Imām, “May I be sacrificed for thee, I dislike the interpretation of this *Nāṣib* (enemy of the Ahl al-Bayt).”

1 *Furū‘ al-Kāfi* 8/292: Chapter regarding the hunted animals of falcons and vultures.

He responded, “O the son of Muslim! May Allah never make you witness evil. Our interpretations are never in harmony with theirs and their interpretations are never in harmony with ours. And the interpretation is not what he had said.”

So I said to him, “May I be sacrificed for thee. So then what was your statement ‘you answered accurately’ and your oath thereupon supposed to mean?”

He said, “Yes I took an oath and I meant that he was accurate in giving the wrong answer.”¹

A point worth noting: was there any valid reason to practice Taqiyyah in this context? And was Abū Ḥanīfah a person of authority and governance that he was feared and owing to whose presence Taqiyyah had to be practiced? And was there any need to falsely praise him and take an oath thereupon and then dub him an enemy of the Ahl al-Bayt and invalidate his answer after his departure? Can there be any other explanation for this besides deceiving and lying without any valid reason. We exonerate Ja‘far from this lie which is attributed to him and say that this is criticising and reviling Ja‘far by those very people who claim to be his diehard supporters.

Furthermore, according to the Shī‘ah the status of a person is ascertained by the amount of lies he speaks. So the more a person speaks lies the higher his status goes in the eyes of the Shī‘ah. Therefore, we find that Muḥammad Bāqir al-Ṣadr lavishly praises Ḥusayn ibn Rūḥ and says and that he very adequately carried out the task of the *Bābiyyah* because:

كان مسلكه الالتزام بالتقية المضاعفة بنحو ملفت النظر بإظهار الاعتقاد بمذهب أهل السنة

His strategy was to exercise Taqiyyah abundantly in a way that he would give the impression that he is on the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah.²

1 Rawḍah al-Kāfi 8/292.

2 Tārīkh al-Ghaybah al-Ṣughrā p. 411.

The following narration appears in the *Ghaybah* of al-Ṭūsī:

عن عبد الله بن غالب قال: ما رأيت من هو أعدل من أبي القاسم الحسين بن روح. ولعهدي به يوما في دار ابن يسار. وكان له محل عند السيد والمقتدر عظيم، وكانت العامة -أيضا- تعظمه... وعهدي به وقد تناظر اثنان، فزعم واحد أن أب بكر أفضل الناس بعد رسول الله صلي الله عليه وآله وسلم ثم عمر ثم علي. وقال الآخر: بل علي أفضل من عمر. فزاد الكلام بينهما فقال أبو القاسم رضي الله عنه: الذي اجتمعت الصحابة عليه هو تقديم الصديق ثم بعده الفاروق ثم بعده عثمان ذو النورين ثم علي الوصي. وأصحاب الحديث علي ذلك وهو الصحيح عندنا. فبقي من حضر المجلس متعجبا من هذا القول وكاد العامة الحضور يعرفونه علي رؤوسهم وكثر الدعاء له والطعن علي من يرميه بالرفض. فوقع علي الضحك فلم أزل أتصبر وأمنع نفسي وأدس كمي في فمي. فخشيت أن أفتضح فوثبت عن المجلس ونظر إلي ففطن بي. فلما حصلت في منزلي فإذا الباب يطرق فخرجت مبادرا بأبي القاسم الحسين بن روح راكبا بغلته قد وافاني من المجلس قبل مضيه إلي داره. فقال لي: يا أبا عبد الله -أيذك الله- لم ضحكت؟ فأردت أن تهتف بي كأن الذي قلته عندك ليس بحق. فقلت كذلك هو عندي. فقال لي: اتق الله أيها الشيخ فإني لا أجعلك في حل تستعظم هذا القول مني. فقلت: يا سيدي! رجل يري بأنه صاحب الإمام ووكيله يقول ذلك القول لا يتعجب منه ويضحك من قوله هذا. فقال لي: لئن عدت لأهجرنك وودعني وانصرف

‘Abd Allah ibn Ghālib mentions, “I did not see anyone more intelligent than Abū al-Qāsim al-Ḥusayn ibn Rūḥ. I recall that one day he was at the house of Ibn Yaṣār (he was a person who was well-respected; al-Sayyid and al-Muqtadir and the masses would also respect him) and I recall that two people were debating. One claimed that Abū Bakr was the most virtuous after Rasūl Allah ﷺ, then ‘Umar, and then ‘Alī. And the other claimed that ‘Alī was more virtuous than ‘Umar. The discussion ensued for quite a while between them till eventually Abū al-Qāsim رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said, “The stance that the Ṣaḥābah agreed upon is giving preference to Abū Bakr, then ‘Umar, then ‘Uthmān, the bearer of two lights, and then ‘Alī, the successor of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. The scholars of ḥadīth also concur on the same. And this is the correct stance according to us as well. This left all the people in the gathering astounded. The commonality in the gathering were almost about to pick him up on their heads and people made lots of supplication in his favour and criticised those who cursed him of being a Shī‘ī. So I felt the urge to laugh but I controlled myself and I put my sleeve in my mouth in order to prevent myself from laughing. I feared that I would become exposed and hence left the gathering. Al-Ḥusayn ibn Rūḥ saw me and understood what was happening.

When I subsequently reached home I heard a knock on the door. I immediately came out and it was Abū al-Qāsim al-Ḥusayn ibn Rūḥ mounted on his mule. He had come to visit me before going home.

He said to me, “O Abū ‘Abd Allah, may Allah aid you, why did you laugh and intend to give the impression that what I had said is not the truth according to you?”

I said to him, “The matter is the same according to me.”

He then said, “Fear Allah, O person! For I do not give you the permission to consider this statement too grave to be said by me.”

I replied, “O my master! If a person who considers himself the representative and companion of the Imām makes such statements, then it is not strange that someone laughs at him.”

He said to me, “By your life,¹ if you do that again in the future I will not interact with you.”

He then bid me farewell and went away.²

Despite the length of this incident I cited it here to show how they deceive the Ahl al-Sunnah, how they say with their tongues that which is not in their hearts and how they laugh amongst themselves at how they outwardly agree with the Ahl al-Sunnah out of hypocrisy and lying. Sadly, the Shī‘ī mentality in our times still adheres to this hypocrisy.³

They have many more narrations of this nature. If it was not for the limitedness of time I would have presented them all and subsequently analysed them. This

1 To take an oath with anyone other than Allah is from the Sharī‘ah of the representative and the infallible Imām and his *Bāb* (door).

2 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 236-237.

3 Muḥammad Bāqir al-Ṣadr: *Tārīkh al-Ghaybah al-Ṣughrā* p. 385. Therein he makes mention of this story approving it and praising the strategy.

topic requires an exclusive study which will expose the strategies of the Shī'ah and their plays.¹

Their Evidence for Taqiyyah:

The Shī'ah have tried to substantiate their doctrine of Taqiyyah² with the verses of Sūrah Āl 'Imrān³ and Sūrah Naḥl,⁴ etc.⁵ But their substantiation from both these verses is incorrect, as has become clear from the exposition of their conception of Taqiyyah in the previous pages. Hence the scholars have, after understanding the reality of the Shī'ah, concluded that their Taqiyyah is nothing but lies and hypocrisy. This has already become clear to us from a text from the Shī'ī sources which was cited previously.

So as you have seen, the Taqiyyah of the Shī'ah is nothing but hypocrisy and lies. Despite that they consider it to be part of dīn, rather dīn itself. You have also realised that their situation is more akin to the hypocrites than it is to a coerced

1 See some of these narrations in: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 75/402, onwards.

2 See *al-Shī'ah fī al-Mizān* p. 49-50.

3 Verse no. 28.

4 Verse no. 106:

مَنْ كَفَرَ بِاللَّهِ مِنْ بَعْدِ إِيمَانِهِ إِلَّا مَنْ أُكْرِهَ وَقَلْبُهُ مُطْمَئِنٌّ بِالْإِيمَانِ

Whoever disbelieves in [i.e., denies] Allah after his belief...662 except for one who is forced [to renounce his religion] while his heart is secure in faith.

5 They try to prove their case by way of esoteric interpretations of the remaining verses. For example:

فَمَا اسْتَطَاعُوا أَنْ يَظْهَرُوهُ وَمَا اسْتَطَاعُوا لَهُ نَقْبًا

So they [i.e., Gog and Magog] were unable to pass over it, nor were they able [to effect] in it any penetration.

I.e. They were unable to penetrate it because of practicing Taqiyyah. And the verse:

فَإِذَا جَاءَ وَعْدُ رَبِّي جَعَلَهُ دَكَّاءَ

But when the promise of my Lord comes [i.e., approaches], He will make it level.

They aver that Taqiyyah will be raised subsequent to which Allah will take revenge from his enemies. (See: *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī* 2/351; *al-Burhān* 2/486; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 5/168, etc.). There are many other verses as well. See: *Fikrah al-Taqrīb* p. 220-221.

person who is coerced to say the words of disbelief whilst his heart is content upon īmān.

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions the following regarding the difference between the Taqiyyah of hypocrisy and the Taqiyyah of Islam:

التقية... ليست بأن اكذب وأقول بلساني ما ليس في قلبي فإن هذا نفاق، ولكن أفعّل ما أقدر عليه... فالمؤمن إذا كان بين الكفار والفجار لم يكن عليه أن يجاهدهم بيده مع عجزه. ولكن إن أمكنه بلسانه وإلا فقلبه مع أنه لا يكذب ويقول بلسانه ما ليس في قلبه؛ إما أن يظهر دينه وإما أن يكتمه. وهو مع هذا لا يوافقهم علي دينهم كله. بل غايته أن يكون كمؤمن آل فرعون حيث لم يكن موافقا لهم علي جميع دينهم ولا كان يكذب ولا يقول بلسانه ما ليس في قلبه. بل كان يكتّم إيمانه وكتمان الدين شيء وإظهار الدين الباطل شيء آخر. فهذا لم يبيحه الله قط إلا لمن أكره بحيث أبيح له النطق بكلمة الكفر فيعذره الله في ذلك. المنافق الكذاب لا يعذر بحال. ثم إن المؤمن الذي يعيش بين الكفار مضطرا ويكتّم إيمانه يعاملهم -بمقتضي الإيمان الذي يحمله- بصدق وأمانة ونصح وإرادة للخير بهم كما كان يوسف الصديق يشير في أهل مصر وكانوا كفارا... بخلاف الرافضي الذي لا يترك شرا يقدر عليه إلا فعله بمن خالفه.

Taqiyyah is not that I lie and say with my tongue that which is not in my heart; that is hypocrisy, but Taqiyyah is to do what I am capable of doing. Hence when a believer is amidst disbelievers and imposters, it is not his duty to combat them with his hand when being unable to do so. Rather it is his duty to combat them with his tongue, or else with his heart, but without lying and saying that which is not in his heart. That is he can either express his faith or conceal it, and when concealing it he will not agree with them completely in the practices of their faith. In essence, his condition should be akin to the condition of the believer of the family of Pharaoh who did not agree with them in every aspect of their creed, lie or say with his tongue that which was not in his heart. Rather he would conceal his faith. Therefore, concealing your faith is one thing and expressing a wrong faith is another. The latter was never permitted by Allah ﷻ but for a person who is coerced, for it is permissible for him to utter the words of disbelief.¹ Allah will excuse such a person but he will not excuse a liar and a hypocrite.

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/260.

Furthermore, a believer who has to desperately live among disbelievers and conceal his īmān will, due to the dictates of his īmān, deal with them with honesty, trustworthiness, well-wishing and goodness even though he does not agree with them in their faith. This was how Yūsuf عليه السلام lived amidst the people of Egypt as an advisor even though they were disbelievers, as opposed to a Shī'ī who is not willing to leave any stone unturned in causing harming to those who oppose him is his creed.¹

1 Ibid.

Chapter Four

The Doctrine of the Mahdī and Occultation

In this chapter, with the help of Allah ﷻ, I will endeavour to discuss the doctrine of the Mahdī and his occultation according to the Shī'ah in general. Thereafter I will shed light upon the inception of this doctrine in the Twelver dogma specifically. Subsequent to that I will present an overall understanding of this doctrine according to them, the evidences they present in substantiation thereof, the arguments they present to defend the extended period of the occultation of their Mahdī, who is now in occultation for more than eleven centuries and a brief analyses thereof.

Thereafter I will make mention of the utopian state which the Shī'ah envisage will come into existence after the emergence of their Mahdī; a state based merely upon their imaginations which they have expressed in the form of narrations which they attribute to the Ahl al-Bayt in order to accord them sanctity and reverence in the sight of their followers. Hence I will present what they say regarding his Sharī'ah, his personal life and his army.

Subsequently, I will present what the Shī'ah believe regarding the period of occultation, the principles that they have invented for this period, the many rulings of Sharī'ah which they have rescinded because of this doctrine and the endeavour of their scholars to make up for the absence of their Mahdī by contriving the doctrine of the representation of the Mahdī.

I will thereafter end this discussion with a general analyses and critique of these doctrines.

The Doctrine of the Mahdī and the Occultation According to the Various Sects of the Shī‘ah

The idea of believing in a hidden and absent Imām exists in majority of the belief structures of the various Shī‘ī denominations. After the death of its Imām each of them believes that he did not die; each one asserts that he will live forever, he is in hiding and he will return to the people as the Mahdī in the future. These sects, in actual fact, only differ regarding the identity of the Mahdī whom they assume will return to the world, which is akin to the difference which they have regarding the personalities of the Imāms one among who is the Mahdī.

The Saba’iyyah (followers of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’) are considered to be the first people, as is asserted by al-Qummī, al-Nawbakhtī, al-Shahrastānī, and others; to believe in the re-emergence of ‘Alī¹ and his occultation.² They would claim thus:

إن عليا لم يقتل ولم يموت ولا يقتل ولا يموت حتي يسوق العرب بعصاه ويملا الأرض عدلا وقسطا كما
ملئت ظلما وجورا

‘Alī has not been assassinated, nor has he died; and he will not be killed and he will not die till he drives the Arabs with his stick and fills the land with justice just as it was previously filled with injustice and oppression.³

And when ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ was informed of the demise of ‘Alī عليه السلام whilst he was in Madā’in he said:

كذبت لو جئتنا بدماعه في سبعين صرة، و أقمت علي قتله سبعين عدلا لعلمنا أنه لم يموت ولم يقتل ولا
يموت حتي يملك الأرض

You are lying. If you bring me his brains in seventy bags and you establish seventy upright people as attestors to his assassination we will still have

1 I.e. they did not claim the continuation of Imāmah after him.

2 Al-Qummī: *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Fīraq* p. 19-20; al-Nawbakhtī: *Fīraq al-Shī‘ah* p. 22; al-Shahrastānī: *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* 1/174.

3 *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Fīraq* p. 19; *Fīraq al-Shī‘ah* p. 22; *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/86.

confidence that he has not passed away or been killed. And he will not die till he establishes dominion over the entire world.¹

The Saba'iyyah continued to anticipate the re-emergence of 'Alī عليه السلام from his hiding. Thereafter this doctrine spread from them to some of the sub-sects of the Kaysāniyyah like that of the Kurabiyyah². When Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah passed away they claimed the following regarding him:

حي لم يمّت و هو في جبل رضوي بين مكة والمدينة عن يمينه أسد و عن يساره نمر موكلان به يحفظانه
إلي أوان خروجه و قيامه

He is alive and has not passed on. He is currently in the Raḍwā Mountain between Makkah and Madīnah. On his right there is a lion and on his left there is a cheetah who are both appointed to safeguard him till the time of his re-emergence.³

1 *Firaq al-Shī'ah* p. 23; *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 21.

2 Kurabiyyah: the followers of Abū Kurayb al-Ḍarīr (a brief analyses of the Kaysāniyyah has passed previously).

3 One of their poets has also said the following poem in this regard:

ولا الحق أربعة سواء	إلا إن الأئمة من قريش
هم الأسباط ليس بهم خفاء	علي والثلاثة من بنيه
وسبط غيبته كربلاء	فسبط سبط إيمان وصدق
يقود الخيل يقدمها اللواء	وسبط لا يذوق الموت حتي
برضوي عنده عسل وماء	تغيب لا يري عنا زمانا

Behold the Imāms are from Quraysh, they are the guardians of the truth and are four.

'Alī and three of his sons, they are his posterity without there being any ambiguity regarding them.

One son was a son of faith and truthfulness, and Karbalā' made the second son disappear.

And the third son will not taste death, till he drives the horses who will be led by a flag.

He has disappeared from us and will be seen for a period of time, in Raḍwā where he has honey and water.

See: *Masā'il al-Imāmah* p. 26; *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1.92-93; *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* p. 41. The books of heresiography contain the poems of other poets as well, see: *Masā'il al-Imāmah* p. 26, 27, 28, 29. Al-Baghdādī has composed a few poems in refutation of these. See: *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* p. 41-43.

They would also claim that he was the awaited Mahdī;¹ they would assert regarding him that he is gone into occultation for a period of seventy years in the mountain of Raḍwā and will appear thereafter and establish a kingdom for them, and kill the tyrants of the Banū Umayyah.² However, when seventy years passed and none of their hopes materialised some of their poets endeavoured to make this belief seem plausible to the followers and convince them to anticipate his return even if the ‘Mahdī’ was gone into hiding for the duration of the age of Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام.³

From here onwards the doctrine of the Mahdī, his occultation, and his re-emergence became a salient belief of the other Shī‘ī denominations as well. Hence after the demise of each Imām of the Ahl al-Bayt there would emerge a new sect from among his followers who would make this claim regarding him and anticipate his return. This is why we find that the Shī‘ī sects have differed tremendously as to the personality of the Imām who they terminate the line of Imāmāh on and whose return they anticipate. Hence al-Sam‘ānī says:

ثم إنهم في انتظارهم الإمام الذي انتظروه مختلفون اختلافا يلوح عليه حمقٌ بليغ

From the mammoth differences which the Shī‘ah have regarding the anticipation of the Imām who they await, their outright dim-wittedness is completely clear.⁴

To the extent that even a sub-sect of the Zaydiyyah, i.e. the Jārudiyyah, were influenced by the devious belief of awaiting the return of their Imām who passed

1 Masā’il al-Shī‘ah p. 26; Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn 1/92; al-Farq bayn al-Firaq p. 39; al-Tabṣīr Fī al-Dīn p. 18-19.

2 Masā’il al-Imāmāh p. 27.

3 One of their poets says:

ولو غاب عنا عمر نوح أيقنت	منا النفوس بأنه سيؤوب
إني لأرجوه وآمله كما	قد كان يأمل يوسف يعقوب

Even if he stays away from us for the duration of the lifespan of Nūḥ, our hearts are determined to believe that he will return.

I have hope in him and await him, just as Ya‘qūb anticipated Yūsuf.

Masā’il al-Imāmāh p. 29.

4 Al-Ansāb 1/345.

away. The adherents of this sub-sect then differ regarding the actual person whom they await, as is asserted by al-Ash'arī,¹ al-Baghdādī,² al-Shahrastānī,³ and others.⁴ Therefore the claim of some like Aḥmad Amīn⁵ and the suggestion of some like Goldzhier⁶ that the Zaydiyyah refute this doctrine is not correct.

This is the backdrop of the doctrine of occultation according to the various sects of the Shī'ah. It was a doctrine which they held regarding known members of the Ahl al-Bayt who did actually exist in history and who lived their lives like all other people. But when they died the Shī'ah made these claims regarding them because they were not willing to accept their death and claimed that they went into hiding and will return after some time.

As for this doctrine based on its Twelver conception, it is different in the sense that it is linked to a fictitious person who did not exist at all according to the Shī'ah who lived and witnessed the era of its inception. According to them he is more like a figurative person who the people did not see and did not know, whose whereabouts they were not aware of due to him disappearing immediately after his birth. Even the birth itself was not witnessed by anyone and transpired in complete secrecy and inconspicuousness. In fact even the family of this person, its representatives, and the closest people thereof did not know of his conception and his birth. Therefore they all denied his existence. Added to that, the Shī'ah did not come to know of his existence but by way of people who claimed to be his representatives and have contact with him.

This figurative personality is the personality of the Mahdī according to them, and believing in him is one of the cornerstones of their dogma and the fundamental

1 *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/141-142.

2 *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* p. 31-32.

3 *Al-Mīlāl wa al-Niḥāl* 1/158-159.

4 Nashwān: *al-Ḥūr al-'Īn* p. 156.

5 *Ḍuḥā al-Islām* 3/243.

6 *Al-'Aqīdah wa al-Sharī'ah* p. 211.

doctrine of their faith. For after the demise of Ḥasan al-‘Askarī, believing in the occultation of his alleged son became the basis of their beliefs and the foundation of their creedal assertions which keeps their doctrinal edifice from collapsing.

But how did this doctrine come about in the Twelver dogma? This will be investigated ahead.

The Inception of the Doctrine of Occultation according to the Twelvers and its Development

The Condition of the Shī‘ah after the demise of Ḥasan al-‘Askarī

In order to discuss the inception of this doctrine it is first necessary to examine the condition of the Shī‘ah after the demise of Ḥasan al-‘Askarī due to its very strong link with the inception thereof.

After the demise of Ḥasan (their eleventh Imām) in 260 A.H, he was not known to have left a successor or a son. Hence his inheritance was distributed and shared by his brother Ja‘far and his mother,¹ as is asserted by the books of the Shī‘ah themselves.

This caused major consternation in the Shī‘ah world and disunited them, because they were left without an Imām on whose existence their dogma is based; due to him being the evidence of Allah ﷺ upon the land according to them.² To the extent that not even the Qur’ān is evidence unless it is coupled with the Imām, as has passed already, and upon him is based the existence of the world. For, as it appears in a narration, if the world is left without an Imām it will sink.³ Furthermore, he is a source of security for the people. Hence if the Imām is taken from this world it will sway with its inhabitants just as the ocean sways with

1 *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 102; *Firaq al-Shī‘ah* p. 96: therein it is mentioned that no successor of his was seen.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/188.

3 *Ibid.* 1/179.

those who travel upon it.¹ However, the Imām dies without issue and the earth is deprived of an Imām but none of these catastrophes transpired. The Shī'ah were thus gripped with confusion and they disputed greatly in the greatest and most crucial principle of their dogma, i.e. the appointment of an Imām. The Shī'ah thus further diversified either into fourteen sects, as is asserted by al-Nawbakhtī,² or fifteen sects, as is asserted by al-Qummī,³ notwithstanding that both these scholars were Twelvers and were from amongst those who witnessed the divergence of the various sects due to them both being from the third century. Hence their input with regards to what had actually transpired after the demise of Ḥasan is invaluable.

Subsequent to their era, the difference increased. Hence al-Mas'ūdī, a Shī'ī who died in 346 A.H, mentions what reached him regarding the division which transpired after the demise of Ḥasan and states that the divergent sects had reached twenty.⁴ You can well imagine what happened after his time.⁵

These sects all assumed different positions regarding Imāmah, some said that:

إن الحسن بن علي لم يموت، وإنما غاب وهو القائم، ولا يجوز أن يموت ولا ولد له ظاهر، لأن الأرض لا تخلو من إمام

Ḥasan ibn 'Alī is alive, he did not pass away, he has just disappeared and he is the Mahdī. For it is not possible for him to pass away without leaving a known son, for the earth can never be void of an Imām.⁶

So this sect stopped at Ḥasan al-'Askarī and claimed that he is the Mahdī, as was the wont of the Shī'ah after the demise of each individual whom they take as their Imām.

1 Ibid.

2 *Firaq al-Shī'ah* p. 96; al-Mufīd: *al-Fuṣūl al-Mukhtārah* p. 258.

3 *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 102.

4 *Murūj al-Dhahab* 4/190. See also: *al-Ṣawā'iq al-Muḥriqah* p. 168

5 According to me the emergence of new sects only stopped after al-Samarī allegedly claimed to be the representative of the Mahdī, as will come ahead, and devised the idea of Bābiyyah

6 *Firaq al-Shī'ah* p. 96; *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 106.

Yet another sect was inclined to his death but claimed that he came back to life after his death, however, due to being in occultation he will only re-emerge at a later stage.¹ Whilst we find another sect averring that Imāmah had shifted from him to his brother Ja‘far² and still another sect opining that his Imāmah was invalid due to him dying without issue.³

As for the Twelvers, they opined that Ḥasan al-‘Askarī had a son whose birth and affairs he had kept a secret due to difficult times and the ruler of the time being in search of him. As a result, his son did not come to the fore during his lifetime nor did majority of the people come to know about him after his demise.⁴

Converse to all of these views was another view which suggested the following:

إن الحسن بن علي قد صحت وفاة آبائه بتواطئ الأخبار التي لا يجوز تكذيب مثلها، وكثرة المشاهدين لموته، وتواتر ذلك عن الوالي له والعدو، وهذا ما لا يجب الارتياح فيه، وصح بمثل هذه الأسباب أنه لا ولد له، فلما صح عندنا الوجهان ثبت أنه لا إمام بعد الحسن بن علي، وأن الإمامة انقطعت.. كما جاز أن تنقطع النبوة بعد محمد فكذلك جائز أن تنقطع الإمامة، لأن الرسالة والنبوة أعظم خطرا وأجل

The demise of Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī and his forefathers is a confirmed fact which is established by way of incontrovertible reports, the testimony of hordes of people who have testified to their deaths and the unanimity of friends and foe in this regard. Hence there is no room for any doubt in this regard whatsoever. Likewise by way of similar evidences it is established that he did not have a son. When both these aspects are well established, it is obvious that there is no Imām to come after Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī and that Imāmah has reached its end. Hence, just as Nubuwwah terminated after the demise of Muḥammad ﷺ, so is it possible for Imāmah to end. Because nubuwwah is higher in ranking, it is more indispensable for the creation than Imāmah, the evidence of Allah through its medium is more

1 *Firaq al-Shī‘ah* p. 97; *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 107.

2 *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 110.

3 *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 109; *Firaq al-Shī‘ah* 100-101.

4 *Al-Irshād* p. 389.

complete and the excuses for disbelief much more minimal; also keeping in mind that with Nubuwwah came along clear-cut evidences and awe-inspiring personalities, but it still came to an end. Likewise it is possible for Imāmah to come to an end.¹

This is how their views differed and their standpoints diversified and they split into groups and sects, each sect happy with what it believed. The confusion at that time was so overwhelming that some actually chose neutrality:

نحن لا ندري ما نقول في ذلك وقد اشتبه علينا الأمر

We do not know what to say in this regard for the issue has become convoluted upon us.²

This was a broad outline of the differences that occurred after the demise of Ḥasan among the Shī'ah.

Impetuses for believing in occultation

Perhaps the reader will be appalled at the adamancy of believing in the Imāmah of a specific individual of the Ahl al-Bayt to the extent of denying the death of the one who died, claiming his life after his demise, or imaginatively contriving a son for a person who had no children. Very few among them reverted to guidance after the obscurities crystallised after the demise of the Imām without issue, abandoned their fanaticism and 'partisanship', and became of the opinion that Imāmah had reached its culmination and continued with life. Probably it was this batch of people who were really the sincere partisans of the Ahl al-Bayt all along, but when the issue became clear and the obscurities were revealed they stepped back.

The most crucial reason for this adamancy becomes clear from the disputes of these sects in order that each sect supports its viewpoint and succeeds with the

1 *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 107-108; *Firaq al-Shī'ah* p. 105.

2 *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 108; *Firaq al-Shī'ah* 105.

largest followership (for every sect would lay claim to a ‘Mahdī’ and would refute the claims of the others) and amidst all of this the reality leaks out so that we may come to know of it. For example, we come to know of what the Twelvers (who believe in the termination of Imāmah upon the alleged son of Ḥasan al-‘Askarī) say in exposing the reality of the claim of another sect which believed in the occultation and termination of Imāmah upon Mūsā al-Kāẓim. The Twelvers says:

مات أبو إبراهيم (موسي الكاظم) وليس من قوامه أحد إلا وعنده المال الكثير. وكان ذلك سبب وقفهم
وجحدهم موته طمعا في الأموال. كان عند زياد بن مروان القندي سبعون ألف دينار وعند علي بن أبي
حمزة ثلاثون ألف دينار.

The father of Ibrāhīm (Mūsā al-Kāẓim) passed away and there was none among his representatives but that he possessed a huge sum of money. Hence the reason why they stopped at him and denied his death was due to their greed for wealth; Ziyād ibn Marwān al-Qandī had seventy thousand Dirhams and ‘Alī ibn Abī Ḥamzah had thirty thousand Dirhams.¹

There are many similar narrations which feature in their books in this regard which divulge the reality of the matter.² Hence the underlying reason for the claim of the occultation of the Imām and the anticipation of his return was the greed of wealth. There were always groups of people who benefitted tremendously from their deceiving claims of ‘partisanship for the Ahl al-Bayt’ by entrapping the laity and amass their wealth with the pretence of being the representatives of the Imāms. And when the Imām would pass away they would deny his death so that the money that they amassed would remain in their possession and so that they may continue to amass wealth with the pretence of *Khums* (one fifth) for the hidden Imām. In this way did the proceedings of usurpation and larceny come to being. Unfortunately it is the laity and the riffraff who are the victims, who give their wealth to those whom they assume are the representatives of the Imām in the Islāmic countries, to people who have found this easy amassment

¹ Al-Ṭūsī: *Al-Ghaybah* p. 42-43.

² See: the aforementioned reference p. 43, onwards; *Rijāl al-Kashshī*: Narrations no. 759, 871, 888, 893.

of booty very plausible. Hence they continue to kindle in the hearts 'love for the Ahl al-Bayt' and deep resentment for the 'oppression' that they suffered from by continuously talking about the tribulations of the Ahl al-Bayt and claiming their rights. All of this with the intention of disuniting the Ummah and amassing wealth in order to nourish their clandestine movements and organisations which are working toward the destruction of the Muslim empire.

Another reason perhaps for believing in a 'Mahdī' and his occultation was the desire of the Shī'ah to establish an independent political system different to that of the Islamic empire. This is what we can gather from the importance they lend to the doctrine of Imāmah. But when their aspirations remained unfulfilled and they were overpowered, dominated, and debased they endeavoured to run away from reality and resort to dreams and false hopes, more of a psychological escape for themselves from frustration and for their followers from despondency. Hence they started to evoke hope in the hearts of their followers assuring them that the end result will be in their favour. Therefore, believing in a 'Mahdī' and his occultation provides enough of impetus for his false propagators to contend with the overwhelming causes of despondency and the loss of morale, the monetary benefits that come along notwithstanding.

Similarly, Shī'ism has always been the convenient abode for people of variant religions and denominations. For in it they find the suitable milieu wherein they can accomplish their goals and find basis for their devious beliefs. Hence different types of people, holding extreme views and beliefs, joined the caravan of Shī'ism. This amalgam of people then slowly drove the 'Shī'ah' back to their devious inherited beliefs, especially after the Shī'ah had separated themselves from the core beliefs of the Ummah and its unanimity.

Therefore, it can safely be said that the belief in the 'Mahdī' and his occultation, based on its Shī'ī conception, has its roots in other religions and devious sects due to which it is not difficult to assert that the adherents of these religions played a pivotal role in entrenching this belief in the hearts and minds of the Shī'ah.

Hence some of the Orientalists are of the opinion that this doctrine has its roots in Judaism, because the Jews believe that Elijah was raised to the heavens and he will return at the end of time. He is thus fit to be an exemplar for the Imāms of the Shī'ah who are in hiding.¹

However, according to me this is insufficient to show Judaic origins, because in Islam ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was raised to the heavens and he will return at the end of time. So this ideology that they have presented is not foreign to the principles of Islam, but because the Orientalists do not believe in the idea of a Mahdī they have made this assertion. The Judaic influences on the Shī'ī dogma, however, can be noted in many other ways, one being that the idea of occultation was founded by Ibn Saba' who was a Jewish rabbi.

Likewise, one of the Shī'ī poets has averred that the doctrine of the Mahdī is sourced from the narrations and tales of Ka'b al-Aḥbār who was a Jew prior to Islam. This is emphatically clear in the poem of Kathīr 'Izzah, a poet of the Kaysāniyyah, which he said regarding Ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah:

هو المهدي خبرناه كعب أخو الأخبار في الحقب الخوالي

He is the Mahdī, of that Ka'b informed us, who was the friend of the Rabbis
in the time that has passed.²

And Van Vloten says, "As for us, the people of the west, the doctrine of the awaited Mahdī has attracted the attention of especially the Orientalists amongst us."³

He then goes on to establish a link between this doctrine and the Israelite narrations and eventually concludes that it is originally from Judaism and Christianity. He avers this because it falls under the realm of prophecies regarding certain

1 Goldzhier: *Al-'Aqīdah wa al-Sharī'ah* p. 192.

2 *Dīwān Kathīr 'Izzah* 1/275.

3 *Al-Siyādah al-'Arabiyyah wa al-Isrā'īliyyāt* p. 110.

individuals and specific events. And these types of prophecies are abundantly found in the books of the Israelites and were not commonly known among the Arabs initially, but it reached them through the medium of the Jews and the Christians who accepted Islam.¹

It is obvious that this link that he creates between this doctrine and Judaism and Christianity merely because it falls under the realm of prophesising regarding aspects of the unseen, which was unknown to the Arabs as he alleges, is a very weak link. Simply because one of the miracles of the Arabian Hashimī prophet of Islam ﷺ was foretelling some of the events of the unseen. However, these people try to resolve these issues based on their disbelieving mentality and their negative viewpoint regarding the prophethood of Muḥammad ﷺ.

My preference in this regard is that the Twelver doctrine of the Mahdī and his occultation originated from Zoroastrians because most of the Shī'ah were from Persia and one of the prevalent religions of Persia back then was Zoroastrianism. And the Zoroastrians claim that they have an awaited leader who is alive and will be rightly guided, he is from the children of Bishtasif the son of Bahrasif and his is known as Abshāwathan. He is in a very big fort which is somewhere between Khorasan and China.²

This is in accordance with the very core of the Twelver dogma.

The Founder of the Doctrine of Occultation According to the Twelvers:

If Ibn Saba' was the founder of the doctrine of Naṣṣ, emphatic nomination, regarding 'Alī, as is documented in the heresiography books of the Shī'ah and the others, there was another Ibn Saba' who contrived the substitute for the doctrine of Imāmah after it had effectively ended with the termination of the posterity of Ḥasan al-'Askarī, or he was one among those who contrived this substitute,

1 Ibid. 112.

2 *Tathbīt Dalā'il al-Nubuwwah* 1/179.

but surely a key role player in its invention. This person was known as ‘Uthmān ibn Sa‘īd al-‘Amrī.¹ He played his role very secretly, for he was a businessman who dealt in butter in order to keep the conspiracy a secret. He would collect the monies which were collected from the followers with the pretext of Khums and the right of the Ahl al-Bayt and place them in bags and skins of butter exercising precaution and due to fear.² In his claims he alleged that Ḥasan had a son who went into hiding at the age of four³ and that no one could meet him besides him due to him being the representative between him and the Shī‘ah; his duty was to collect their wealth, and take details of their queries and problems and present them to the Imām.

What is astonishing is that the Shī‘ah claim that they do not accept the edicts of anyone besides the infallible Imām, to the extent that they are willing to abandon the consensus of the Ummah if the infallible Imām is not part of it. But here in one of its most crucial beliefs it embraces the claims of a fallible individual, notwithstanding that they were other people also who made similar claims as him, each one claimed that he is the *Bāb* (door) to the hidden Imām and the bickering that ensued because of that was outrageous. Each one of them would produce an endorsed letter which he claimed was the letter of the awaited hidden Imām which entailed the refutation of the other claimants and curses upon them. Al-Ṭūsī has made mention of their names under the chapter ‘mention of the impugned who claimed to be the *Bāb* may Allah curse them’.⁴

1 Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb is of the opinion that the person who invented the idea of occultation was Muḥammad ibn Naṣīr, one of the clients of Banū Namīr (*al-Khuṭū‘ al-‘Arīḍah* p. 37). In the books of the Twelvers it appears that he was the one who claimed to be the *Bāb* (the door) to the absent Imām. Prior to him a person known as al-Sharī‘ī made a similar claim and many others followed him in making similar claims. (See: al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 244.

2 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 214-215; Muḥammad al-Sadr: *Tārīkh al-Ghaybah al-Ṣuḡhrā* p. 396-397.

3 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 258. They have differed greatly as to the age wherein he went into occultation due to their disparate narrations in this regard, as will come shortly. Al-Majlisī says: Most of the narrations suggest that he was a less than five years old by a few months or by a year and a few months (*Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/123).

4 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 244.

And as the books of the Shī'ah record, 'Uthmān ibn Sa'īd had representatives in most of the Muslim metropolises who would claim the Imāmah of this fictitious Mahdī and allege that 'Uthmān ibn Sa'īd was the Bāb to him. Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī has listed these representatives, the most exhaustive list of them according to Muḥammad Bāqir al-Ṣadr.¹ Besides these representatives there were others as well who were not approved of by 'Uthmān and his comrades, mention of seven of whom al-Ṭūsī has made under the title, 'mention of the impugned among the representatives of the Imāms'.²

The difference, according to them, between the Bāb and the representative is that the Bāb meets with the hidden Imām and the representative meets with the Bāb and does not have any access to the Imām. He merely serves as a link between the Shī'ah and the Bāb.³

After the demise 'Uthmān ibn Sa'īd, the first reliable Bāb according to the Twelvers, his son Muḥammad was appointed. However some people were not happy with his appointment owing to which disputes and mutual imprecation ensued.

Hence when one of the opponents who was known as Aḥmad ibn Hilāl al-Karkhī was asked:

ألا تقبل أمر أبي جعفر محمد بن عثمان وترجع إليه وقد نص عليه الإمام المفترض الطاعة؟ فقال لهم: لم أسمعنه ينص عليه بالوكالة ولست أنكر أباه-يعني عثمان بن سعيد- فأما أن أقطع أن أبا جعفر وكيل صاحب الزمان فلا أجسر عليه. فقالوا: قد سمعنه غيرك فقال: أنتم وما سمعتم... فلعنوه وتبرؤوا منه

“Do you not accept the appointment of Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn 'Uthmān and resort to him whereas he was emphatically appointed by the Imām whose obedience is mandatory.”⁴

1 *Tārīkh al-Ghaybah al-Ṣughrā* p. 60.

2 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 213-214.

3 *Tārīkh al-Ghaybah al-Ṣughrā* p. 609.

4 They are referring to the hidden Imām. Because they consider what the first Bāb said to be the edict of the Imām due to him being the Bāb to him and his only vicegerent. Hence his appointment of his son was treated as holy and from the Imām the denier of which deserves to be cursed.

He said, "I did not hear him emphatically appointing him to the station of representation. I do not deny the station of his father, but I will not take the courage of asserting that Abū Ja'far is the representative¹ of the man of the time."

They retorted, "But others besides you heard it."

To which he responded by saying, "I leave you to what you heard..."

Hence they eventually cursed him and disowned him.²

Some of their documents reveal the reason for this dispute. Al-Ṭūsī, for example narrates from a person by the name Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Bilāl who refused to accept the Bāb status of Muḥammad ibn 'Uthmān al-'Amrī because of which the famous dispute ensued between the two of them, as he alleges. The underlying reason was that the former hoarded the wealth that he had of the Imām and refused to hand it over and claimed that he was the representative till eventually the people disowned him and cursed him.³

So as you can see, he was 'Uthmān ibn Sa'īd's partner in the representation, but when 'Uthmān died he took the wealth for himself. These disputes and quarrels regarding being a Bāb and being a representative were due to amassing wealth. For if there really was an absent Imām who was controlling the affairs of his followers through the intermediary of the Bābs all this wealth would not have ended up in the possession of this cunning person, and he would not have been the confidant of the Imām, the man of the time, due to him having knowledge of the past and the future. Why did the Imām not issue a warning against this person from the very beginning in order not to allow him to collect the wealth of the people? The reality is that there was no Imām, rather there were groups of

1 It should be noted that the narration calls him a *Wakīl*, a representative, whereas the Twelvers call him the Bāb and they differentiate between the *Wakīl* and the *Bāb*.

2 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 245.

3 *Ibid*.

people who were falsely devouring the wealth of the people under the pretext of Shī'ism and Islam, and were quarrelling because of the wealth as well.

Thereafter, in the year 304 A.H./305 A.H Muḥammad ibn 'Uthmān ibn Sa'īd¹ died after having presided over the position of the Bāb for approximately fifty years² wherein the people would bring their wealth to him and he would produce fully approved letters with the handwriting with which these letters would appear during the lifetime of Hasan. In these letters was contained the important affairs of dīn and this world and eerie answers to the questions people would come with.³

After him a person by the name Abū al-Qāsim Ḥusayn ibn Rawḥ presided over this position. Towards the latter part of the life Muḥammad ibn 'Uthmān, according to their narrations, he would carry out the responsibilities of the Bāb due to being entrusted by him to collect the wealth of the followers. Muḥammad ibn 'Alī al-Aswad says:

كنت أحمل الأموال التي تحصل في باب الوقف إلي أبي جعفر محمد بن عثمان العمري فيقبضها مني فحملت إليه شيئاً من الأموال في آخر أيامه قبل موته بستين أو ثلاث. فأمر بتسليمه إلي أبي القاسم الروحي فكنت أطلبه بالقبوض. فشكا ذلك إلي أبي جعفر (محمد بن عثمان) فأمرني ألا أطلبه بالقبوض وقال: كل ما وصل إلي أبي القاسم فقد وصل إلي. فكنت أحمل بعد ذلك الأموال إليه ولا أطلبه بالقبوض.

I would take the monies which would accumulate at *Bāb al-Waqf* to Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn 'Uthmān al-'Amrī and he would collect them from me. At one occasion I took some monies to him toward the end of his life, about two to three years before his demise, and he told me to hand them over to Abū al-Qāsim al-Rawḥī. At times I would ask him to give me receipts, of which he complained to Abū Ja'far (Muḥammad ibn 'Uthmān) who told me not to ask him for any receipts and said, "Anything that reaches Abū al-Qāsim reaches me." Hence I would take those monies to him and I would not ask him for receipts.⁴

1 Al-Ghaybah p. 223; Rijāl al-Ḥillī p. 149.

2 Al-Ghaybah p. 223; Rijāl al-Ḥillī p. 149.

3 Al-Ghaybah p. 223.

4 Ibid. p. 225-226.

And when one of them hesitated in submitting his wealth to Abū al-Qāsim ibn Rawḥ, Muḥammad ibn ‘Uthmān al-‘Amrī became angry with him and the following ensued:

لم لم تمتثل ما قلته لك

Why did you not comply with what I told you?

The man fearing that he would produce and endorsed letter with an order to curse him and disown him, tried to pacify him and speak to him leniently saying:

لم أجسر علي ما رسمته لي

I did not have the courage to do what you prescribed for me.

However he answered him angrily saying:

قم كما أقول لك. فلم يكن عند غير المبادرة. فصرت إلي أبي القاسم بن روح وهو في دار ضيقة فعرفته ما جري فسر به وشكر الله عز وجل ودفعت إليه الدنانير وما زلت أحمل إليه ما يحصل في يدي بعد ذلك من الدنانير

“Go and do as I tell you to do.”

The man says:

I had no other option but to comply immediately. Hence I went to Abū al-Qāsim ibn Rawḥ who was at that time seated in a very small house and told him what had happened. He was delighted and thanked Allah ﷻ. I gave him the Dinars and thereafter continuously submitted all the Dinars that came into my possession.¹

You can see the sanctity, infallibility, and the compulsory compliance that the Shī‘ah accord to their symbols and signs, so much that a person who does not comply is cursed and disowned.

¹ *Al-Ghaybah* p. 224.

Likewise, you will have noticed that the prevalent language in the endorsed letters which they attribute to the Mahdī, and which were conveyed via the communication of the Bābs and the representatives, was that of money.

The reason why Abū al-Qāsim was chosen is that he preserved the secret of the whereabouts of the Mahdī very well. This was because the election of a Bāb materialised at the hands of the Shī'ī offices after having fulfilled specific requirements. The most important of which was probably being able to keep the secret and not let it come to the fore. This is understood from a narration which al-Ṭūsī cites in his *al-Ghaybah*, it reads as follows:

إن سهلا النوبختي سئل فقليل له: كيف صار هذا الأمر إلي الشيخ أبي القاسم الحسين بن روح دونك؟ فقال: هم أعلم وما اختاروها ولكن أنا رجل ألفي الخصوم وأناظرهم ولو علمت بمكانه كما علم أبو القاسم وضغطتني الحجة علي مكانه لعلني كنت أدل علي مكانه. وأبو القاسم فلو كانت الحجة تحت ذيله وقرض بالمقاريض ما كشف الذيل عنه.

Sahl al-Nawbakhtī was asked, “How did Abū al-Qāsim ibn Rawḥ become the incumbent of this position and not you?”

He said, “They know better whom they have chosen.¹ I am, however, a person who meets with the opponents and debates with them. And if I knew the exact place of the Mahdī just as Abū al-Qāsim knows and if in a debate I would be pressurised to furnish evidence regarding his whereabouts I would direct the people to his place. As for Abū al-Qāsim, even if the *Hujjah* (the Mahdī) was right beneath his garb he would not expose him even though he be cut into pieces with scissors.²

Despite all of this, the election of Abū al-Qāsim ibn Rawḥ gave rise to much controversy among the secretive movements of the Shī'ah. As a result, many of their leaders defected and claimed to be the Bābs for themselves subsequent to which mutual imprecation ensued.

1 Note that he ascribed the election of the Bāb to the scholars of the Shī'ah whereas according to them that is purely the purview of the Mahdī.

2 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 240.

Some among them eventually gave away the secret of what the reality of being a Bāb actually was due to not succeeding with a very good followership. Among them was Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Shalmaghānī who was killed in 323 A.H,¹ he was one of those who claimed to be the vicegerent of the Mahdī of the Shī‘ah and vied with Abū al-Hasan in that regard. He exposes them by saying:

ما دخلنا مع أبي القاسم الروح إلا ونحن نعلم فيما دخلنا فيه. لقد كنا نتهاش علي هذا الأمر كما تهاش الكلاب علي الجيف

We did not enter this affair with Abū al-Qāsim but after fully knowing what we were getting ourselves into. We would quarrel over this matter just as dogs quarrel over carrion.²

Commenting on this narration Aḥmad al-Kisrawī al-Īrānī (a Shī‘ī formally) says:

لقد صدق فيما قال فإن التخاصم لم يكن إلا لأجل الأموال. كان الرجل يجمع المال ويطمع فيه فيدعي البابية لكيلا يسلمه لآخر

He has uttered the truth in what he has said, for their dispute was really only over money. A person would gather wealth and would have greed for it due to which he would claim being the Bāb so that he would not have to hand it over to someone else.³

Moving on, Ibn Rawḥ died in the year 326 A.H, and the station of the Bāb, due to his bequest, moved on to a fourth person who goes by the name Abū al-Hasan ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Samarri.⁴ He had assumed the position after seventy years had already lapsed since the occultation of the Mahdī and the anticipation of the Shī‘ah had been of no avail thus far, despite their eagerness for his emergence.

1 For more details regarding him see: *al-Ghaybah* p. 248; *al-Bidāyah wa Al-Nihāyah* 11/179; *al-Kāmil* 8/290.

2 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 241.

3 *Al-Tashayyu’ wa al-Shī‘ah* p. 33.

4 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 244

The promises of the Shī'ah regarding the emergence of the Mahdī did not materialise due to which doubt started to engulf the Shī'ī circles and reality gradually began coming to the fore after a very virulent dispute ensued between the Bāb claimants. Hence the vibrancy of the last Bāb came to a complete stop, which is why you will not find any endorsed letters, which they attributed to the Mahdī, attributed to his time as you would find them attributed to his predecessors before him. One of the Shī'ī scholars has acknowledged this, even though by evadingly averring that it was due to the immense pressure that was on the Shī'ah at that time.¹

Al-Samarri presided over this artificial position for three years² and probably he was gripped by compunction and realised the trivialness of his post as the vicegerent of the hidden Imām.³ Hence when he was asked upon his death bed as to who would be his successor after him he said:

لله أمر هو بالغه

Allah has a plan in place which he is to complete.⁴

In this manner did the claims of direct communication with the Imām end. Because the false letters and documents came to the fore due to there being intense competition around them.

As a result, the idea of occultation reached a dead end due to the idea of the Bāb not being successful. But the scholars of the Shī'ah, nevertheless, produced an endorsed letter ascribing it to the Mahdī via the medium of al-Samarri stating that direct contact with the Imām has reached its end and it will now be replaced with general representation which will be for the scholars of the Shī'ah in general, as will come ahead.

1 Muḥammad Bāqir al-Sadr: *Tārīkh al-Ghaybah al-Ṣuḡhrā* p. 414

2 Because he died in 329 A.H. See: *al-Ghaybah* p. 243; *Tārīkh al-Ghaybah al-Ṣuḡhrā* p. 413.

3 Ronaldson: *'Aqīdah al-Shī'ah* p. 257.

4 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 242.

Hence after this change, the idea of the occultation of the Mahdī was rescued, the disputes around the position of the Bāb were diffused, the wealth was distributed among all involved equally and the idea of general representation was established which we will discuss in depth after having dealt with the doctrine of the Mahdī.

These four Bābs: ‘Uthmān ibn Sa‘īd, Muḥammad ibn ‘Uthmān, Ibn Rawḥ, and al-Samarī are the founding fathers of the doctrine of the Mahdī and his occultation. Or in other words, they played a pivotal role in contriving the doctrine of the Mahdī based on its Shī‘ī conception. The period wherein they presided over the artificial position of the Bāb is known as *al-Ghaybah al-Ṣuḡhrā*, the minor occultation which remained for a period of seventy years or more.¹

Ahead we will have a look at the doctrine of the Mahdī and his occultation as it appears in the books of the Twelvers and we will delve into some of its discussion because today it has become the cornerstone of the Shī‘ī dogma.

A Broad Overview of the Story of the Mahdī According to the Twelvers

The story of the Mahdī which appears in the books of the Shī‘ah is indeed a very strange one. The threads thereof are weaved by imagination which reaches its wildest limits in sketching the related events. The story has thus transformed into one of the greatest fictitious stories for which there is no room of acceptance according to reason or sound human disposition. No wonder it was rejected by majority of the Shī‘ī sects which witnessed its inception.² Hereunder I shall present

1 One of their scholars and their Āyats Ja‘far al-Najafī says that the *Ghaybah Ṣuḡhrā* lasted for about seventy four years (see: *Kashf al-Ghiṭā’* p. 13). However, it seems as if this time frame is not unanimously accepted among them. In *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* of al-Māmaqānī it is debated. He says, “The seventy four years that is said to be the period of the occultation is an oversight without a doubt, unless it is considered from the time of birth (i.e. the birth of the Mahdī).” He then says that it lasted for sixty eight or sixty nine years minus a month. (*Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* 1/189). Al-Sadr on the other hand mentions that it was seventy years (see: *Tārīkh al-Ghaybah al-Ṣuḡhrā* p. 345).

2 See p. 1114 of this book. The Inception of the Doctrine of Occultation.

a broad overview of the incident, starting from Ḥasan choosing the mother of the Mahdī, to his birth, his occultation, his return, and finally his personal conduct.

As for the meeting of Ḥasan with the mother of the Mahdī, the books of the Shī'ah have sketched its events in a manner that resembles the love tale of a thousand nights. For the choosing of Hasan of the concubine, to who they attribute the son, materialised, based on the Shī'ī reports, by way of having access to the knowledge of the unseen. The details go as follows:

Ḥasan sends his slave to the bazaar where concubines are being sold, he gives him the details of the required concubine, her clothing, the conversation she will strike when purchasing her, and what will happen when bidding for her. He sends with him a letter in the Roman language, of which he informs him that when she will see it she will cry profusely and rub her body with it. Then when the slave goes and is astonished at all the happenings, she discloses her identity and tells him that she is Malīkah, the daughter of Yūsha' ibn Qayṣar—the king of Rome. She goes on to tell him her entire life story and of the difficulties that she had to encounter before her marriage and the proposal to it. She tells him that in a dream she saw that Rasūl Allāh ﷺ came to propose for her to 'Īsā عليه السلام and said to him, “O the mercy of Allāh! I have come to you to propose for the daughter of your apostle Sham'ūn, Malīkah, for this son of mine,” indicating with his hands toward the father of Muḥammad (i.e. Ḥasan al-'Askarī). She continues to see such visions till one day the mother of Ḥasan al-'Askarī visits her and with her comes along Maryam, the daughter of 'Imrān, and a thousand maidens from the maidens of Jannah. Maryam says to her, “This is the queen of the women of Jannah, the mother of your husband Abū Muḥammad عليه السلام.” The mother of the Mahdī thus clings to her crying and complaining of the resistance of Ḥasan al-'Askarī from visiting her. And the mother of Ḥasan tells her, “My son, Muḥammad, cannot visit you whilst you ascribe partners to Allāh.”¹ The story continues till eventually she accepts Islam due to the effects of these dreams and thus subsequently Ḥasan al-'Askarī starts to visit her in her dreams. She then goes on to tell the slave of

1 Abū Muḥammad does not visit her because of her disbelief, but the queen of the women, Maryam, and the maidens of Jannah visit her in this state.

how she was imprisoned by the Muslims, why she had chosen the name Narjis in order to conceal her identity and how she had exhorted her master not to sell her to anyone besides the one whom she is pleased with (the person who came with a full description of who she was regarding whom she was informed in her dreams). She then meets with Ḥasan and does not experience any strangeness when meeting him due to previously knowing him and communicating with him in her dreams. He subsequently gives her the glad tidings of a child who will in the future rule the world from the east to the west and who will fill the land with justice and fairness.¹

As for her conception with the Mahdī, it is even more astonishing and weird. This is due to the fact that there were no signs of pregnancy whatsoever despite Ḥakīmah bint Muḥammad,² as they allege, trying to confirm her pregnancy; She jumps toward her, as their narrations allege, and turned her from front to back but could not discern any signs of pregnancy. She returns to Ḥasan and informs him, but he assures her that conception has taken place and tells her, “When Fajr time comes the child will be born.”³ What is even more astonishing is that the mother of the child herself did not know of her conception till the night of delivery, to the extent that she said to Ḥakīmah, “O my mistress! I do not see any signs of this in me.”⁴

Apparently, denying any signs of pregnancy upon her was a ploy or an endeavour to avoid a fact confirmed even according to the Shīʿah regarding Jaʿfar (the brother of Hasan al-ʿAskarī) confining all the wives and concubines of Ḥasan (after his demise) in order to ascertain whether their wombs were occupied or not. Consequently, it became evident to the judge and the ruler that their wombs were empty which led to the distribution of the inheritance of Ḥasan.⁵

1 See: Ibn Bābawayh: *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 395-400: Chapter regarding what had been narrated regarding the Narjis the mother of the Mahdī.

2 Ḥakīmah bint Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī ibn Mūsā ibn Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq.

3 *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 404.

4 Ibid. p. 404.

5 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 74.

Astonishingly, the very narration which denies the signs of pregnancy being visible even to the mother of the child contradicts itself and towards the end states that the child was speaking in the womb of his mother. Ḥakīmah says:

فأجابني الجنين من بطنها يقرأ مثل ما أقرأ سلم علي

The child responded to me from her womb by reading whatever I was reading and greeting me.¹

Likewise, al-Ṭūsī narrates from Ḥakīmah herself that when Ḥasan called her to his house to oversee the birth of the Mahdī from his concubine she said:

جعلت فداك يا سيدي الخلف ممن هو؟ قال: من سوسن- فأدرت نظري فيهن فلم أر جارية عليها أثر غير سوسن...

“May I be sacrificed for you, O my master! Your deputy, from who is he?”

He said, “From Sawsan.”

She further says, “I had a brief look at all the concubines and I found that none had any signs of pregnancy besides Sawsan.”²

So according to this narration she could easily discern the signs of pregnancy, but in the narration of Ibn Bābawayh she tilted her from front to back but still could not see any signs. Likewise in this narration her name is Sawsan whereas in the previous narration her name was Narjis. And in other narrations she is recorded with other names.³ Each one adds his own details to the narration and the books of the Twelvers encompass all the various narrations.

Nonetheless, when he was born the following ensued:

1 *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 404.

2 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 141.

3 For example: Rayḥānah and Ṣaqīl (see: *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 408).

سقط... من بطن أمه جاثيا علي ركبتيه رافعا سبأتيه إلي السماء ثم عطس فقال: الحمد لله رب العالمين وصلي الله علي محمد وآله. زعمت الظلمة أن حجة الله داحضة لو إذن لنا في الكلام لزال الشك

He fell from the belly of his mother straight on his knees, raising both his index fingers to the heaven. He then sneezed and said, "All praise is due to Allah, the Lord of the universes, may his peace be upon Muḥammad and his household. The oppressors claim that the evidence of Allah has been defeated, if we were given the permission to speak all doubts would have vanished."¹

In another narration it appears that he fell into prostration before Allah reciting the Tashahhud and praying thus:

اللهم أنجز لي ما وعدتني

O Allah fulfil the promise you have made to me.²

He is then taken to the heavens with the conveyance of green birds, and when his mother Narjis cries out of fear over him Ḥasan placates her by saying:

سيعاد إليك كما رد موسى إلي أمه

He will be returned to you just as Mūsā was returned to his mother.³

As for his development, it was completely against the principles of Allah in his creation, it violated all the rules of nature through which every living organism grows and reaches its culmination. This is easily understood from the narration narrated by Ḥakīmah in this regard, she says:

لما كان بعد أربعين يوما دخلت علي أبي محمد عليه السلام فإذا مولانا الصاحب يمشي في الدار فلم أر وجهها أحسن من وجهه ولا لغة أفصح من لغته. فقال أبو محمد عليه السلام: هذا المولود الكريم علي الله

1 Ibid. p. 406; see also: *al-Ghaybah* p. 147.

2 *Ikmal al-Dīn* p. 404-405.

3 Ibid. p. 405.

عز وجل. فقلت: سيدي أري من أمره ما أري وله أربعين يوماً. فتبسم وقال: يا عمتي أما علمت أنا معاشر الأئمة ننشأ في اليوم ما ينشأ غيرنا في السنة

When forty days had passed since his birth I went to visit Abū Muḥammad and behold! I saw our master walking around the house. I did not see a face more beautiful than his, nor did I hear language more eloquent than his.

Abū Muḥammad told me, “This child is very dear to Allah.”

I thus asked him, “O my master! I am seeing what I see of him and he is only forty days old.”

He smiled and said, “O my aunt. Don’t you know that we the Imāms grow as much in a day as others besides us grow in a year?”¹

And the narration of al-Qummī mentions:

إن الصبي منا إذا كان أتي عليه شهر كان كمن أتي عليه سنة. وإن الصبي منا يتكلم في بطن أمه ويقرأ القرآن ويعبد ربه عز وجل عند الرضاع. تطيعه الملائكة وتنزل إليه صباحاً ومساءً

A child from amongst us is such that when a month passes upon him he, in his development, is like the one who a year passes upon. A child from amongst us speaks in the womb of his mother, reads the Qur’ān, worships Allah in his infancy, and the angels obey him² and descend upon him morning and evening.³

Surprising indeed! This child who came with a host of all these extraordinary phenomena is not known to anyone nor is there any trace of his whereabouts. What then was the benefit of all these miracles?

1 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 144.

2 This is what appears in the manuscript. Maybe it ought to be ‘feed him’.

3 *Ikmal al-Dīn* p. 144.

Shortly thereafter he disappeared and no one knew of his affair and his occultation besides Ḥakīmah who, as the narration allegedly claims, said that Ḥasan ordered her not to divulge the matter of this child until she sees the dispute of his followers after his demise. He is reported to have ordered thusly:

فإذا غيب الله شخصي وتوفاني ورأيت شيعتي قد اختلفوا فأخبري الثقات منهم فأن ولي الله يغيبه الله عن خلقه ويحجبه عن عباده فلا يراه أحد حتي يقدم له جبرئيل عليه السلام فرسه ليقتضي الله أمرا كان منفعولا

When Allah makes my body disappear and gives me death and you see my followers quarrelling, then tell the reliable among them (regarding the Mahdī). For verily Allah makes his friend disappear from his creation and obstructs them from him so that no one is able to see him till Jibrīl عليه السلام will present his horse to him so that Allah may fulfil a matter which is bound to happen.¹

Hence the issue of the Mahdī and his occultation leaked out to the Shī'ah through the medium of Ḥakīmah, as the narration of al-Ṭūsī suggests. I do not know how the Shī'ah so readily accept the narration of a lone fallible woman regarding the very core belief of their faith, whereas they are at times willing to part with the unanimity of the Ummah if an infallible Imām is not part of it, even though it be pertaining to a secondary issue.

You will have noticed that the Imām ordered that the matter of the Mahdī be kept a secret but from his reliable partisans, whereas according to them a person who does not know the Imām is equal to a person who knows and worships gods other than Allah,² and a person who dies in this condition dies a death of disbelief and hypocrisy.³

As to the time of his disappearance, the narrations of the Shī'ah are contradictory in this regard. So al-Ṭūsī narrates the following from Ḥakīmah:

1 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 142.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/181.

3 *Ibid.* 1/184.

فلما كان بعد ثلاث (من مولده) اشتقت إلي ولي الله فصرت إليهم فبدأت بالحجرة التي كانت سوسن فيها. فلم أر أثراً ولا سمعت ذكراً فكرهت أن أسأل فدخلت علي أبي محمد عليه السلام فاستحييت أن أبدأ بالسؤال فبدأني فقال: هو يا عمّة في كنف الله وحرزه وستره غيبه حتي يأذن الله له

After three had passed upon his birth, I was desirous of seeing the friend of Allah, so I went to them. I started with the room in which Sawsan was and saw no sign and heard no mention. I disliked querying and thus went to Abū Muḥammad and there also I felt ashamed of initiating the probing. But he spoke first and said, "O aunt, in the mercy of Allah, His protection, His concealment, and His knowledge till when He grants him permission."¹

A second narration mentions that she did not see him after seven days,² whilst a third narration mentions that she saw him walking in the house after forty days and did not see him subsequent to that.³ And yet another narration mentions that Ḥakīmah would frequently go to the house Ḥasan al-‘Askarī, she would visit after every forty days. A few days before his demise (when the age of the Mahdī was five at most)⁴ she went to their house as was her wont. She says:

رأيت رجلاً فلم أعرفه فقلت لابن أخي عليه السلام من هذا الذي تأمرني أن أجلس بين يديه؟ فقال لي: هذا ابن نرجس هذا خليفتي من بعدي وعن قليل تفقدوني فاسمعي له وأطيعي

I saw a person whom I did not recognise. So I said to my nephew, "Who is this person who you are ordering me to sit in front of?"

He said, "This is the son of Narjis, this is my successor. Soon you will miss me so listen and obey."⁵

In this manner did the Mahdī disappear and no one knew of his matter besides Ḥakīmah who only dispensed the information of his occultation to the reliable Shī‘ah as their narrations suggest.

1 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 142.

2 *Ibid.* 142.

3 *Ibid.* 144.

4 Because according to their narrations he was born in 255 A.H and al-‘Askarī passed away in 260 A.H.

5 *Ikmal al-Dīn* p. 405-406.

As to the place of his occultation, it was kept a secret, and when the Shī'ah eventually got to know of his alleged occultation they tried to search for his place. The Bāb, however, who claimed to have a link with him refused to divulge any information about him and sufficed on producing an endorsed letter attributing it to the Mahdī which stated:

إن عرفوا المكان دلوا عليه

If they know of the place they will inform others of it.¹

So this narration states that he was in a specific place and in a hiding spot of which no one was aware besides the Bāb and that the reason for concealing his occultation from his Shī'ah was his fear of them informing others of his whereabouts.

But surprisingly some narrations of *al-Kāfī* inform us of the town wherein he sought to hide. A narration for example mentions:

لا بد لصاحب هذا الأمر من غيبة. ولا بد له في غيبته من عزلة ونعم المنزل طيبة

It is incumbent for the person of this affair to go into occultation. And in his occultation it is necessary for him to be in seclusion. And what a wonderful place is Ṭaybah.²

So this narrations states that he is hiding in Madīnah Munawwarah, for Ṭaybah is one of its names.³ This is supported by another narration wherein Ḥasan al-'Askarī was asked the following:

إن حدث بك حدث فأين أسأل عنه؟ قال: بالمدينة

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/333.

2 Ibid. 1/340; *al-Nu'mānī: al-Ghaybah* p. 125; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/153.

3 *Mu'jam mā Ustu'jīm* 2/900.

“If anything happens to you then where should I ask about him?”

He said, “In Madīnah.”¹

On the hand al-Ṭūsī in his *al-Ghaybah* narrates that he is residing in the Raḍwā Mountain. He says in his narration:

عن عبد الأعلى مولي آل سام: قال خرجت مع أبي عبد الله عليه السلام فلما نزلنا الروحاء نظر إليّ جليها مطلا عليها فقال لي: تري هذا الجبل يدعي رضوي من جبال فارس أحبنا فنقله الله إلينا. أما إن فيه كل شجرة مطعم ونعم أمان للخائف مرتين: إما إن لصاحب هذا الأمر فيه غيبتين: واحدة قصيرة الأخرى طويلة

‘Abd al-A‘lā, the ally of the people of Sām says, “I went with Abū ‘Abd Allāh عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. When we halted at al-Rawḥā”² he gazed at its mountain and said to me, ‘Do you see this mountain? This mountain is known as Raḍwā³ from the mountains of Persia. Due to its love for us Allah ﷻ moved it near us. Behold on it is every nourishing tree and what a pleasant abode of amnesty it will be for the fearful at two occasions. The Man of the time will hide in it at two instances, the first will be short and the next will be long.”⁴

Whilst some other narrations suggest that he is hiding in the valleys of Makkah. Hence in *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* the following narration is narrated from Abū Ja‘far:

يكون لصاحب هذا الأمر غيبة في بعض هذه الشعاب-ثم أوماً بيده إلي ناحية ذي طوي

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfi 1/328. In the commentary of this narration al-Māzindarānī mentions, “Probably he meant *Surr Man Ra‘ā*.” (see: *Sharḥ al-jāmi‘* 6/208). However, this possibility does not seem very plausible in the first narration.

2 Al-Rawḥā’ is a village belonging to the Muzaynah tribe, between it and Madīnah are 41 miles. (See: *Mu‘jam mā Ustu‘jam* 1/681).

3 It is a mountain in Madīnah which has a lot of trees, treasures, and lots of water. It is the very mountain regarding which the Kaysāniyyah assert that Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah is living in and is being sustained. (See: *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 3/51).

4 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 103.

“The man of this affair will disappear in some of these valleys,” he then pointed with his hand toward Dhī Ṭawā.^{1,2}

However, it should be noted that their narrations regarding invocations and visitations of the tombs of the Imāms suggest that he is residing in the basement of Sāmarrā’,³ this is understood from the following:

ثم ائت سرداب الغيبة وقف بين البابين ماسكا جانب الباب بيدك ثم تنحنح كالمستأذن وسم وانزل وعليك
السكينة والوقار. وصل ركعتين في عرصة السرداب وقل... اللهم طال الانتظار وشممت بنا الفجار وصعب
علينا الانتصار. اللهم أرنا وجه وليك الميمون في حياتنا وبعد المنون. اللهم إني أدن لك بالرجعة بين
يدي صاحب هذه البقعة. الغوث الغوث الغوث يا صاحب الزمان. قطعت في وصلتك الخلاف وهجرت
لزيارتك الأوطان وأخفيت أمري عن أهل البلدان لتكون شفيعا عند ربك وربّي

Then go to the basement of occultation and stand between the two doors, holding the sides of the doors with your hands, then cough as if seeking permission, take the name of Allah, and sit with utmost tranquillity and sobriety. Thereafter read two raka‘āt towards the breadth of the basement and supplicate thus, “O Allah, the anticipation has become lengthy, the enemies are rejoicing at our misfortune, and combatting them has become difficult upon us. O Allah, show us the countenance of your blessed friend, during our lifetime and after our demise. O Allah, I acknowledge his return for you in front of the man of this land. Help! Help! Help! O the man of the time. In wanting to visit you I have ended all disputes, I have left my homelands and I have concealed my matter from the people of the cities so that you may intercede for me before your Lord and mine... O my master, O the son of Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī; I have come to you to visit you.”⁴

1 Dhī Ṭawā: A valley in Makkah.

2 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/56; *al-Burhān* 2/81-82; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/341.

3 Yāqūt says, “Sāmarrā’ is a town on the shores of the Euphrates River, it is north of Baghdad and the distance between them is thirty Farsakhs (one Farsakh is approx. five kilometres). It was initially known as Surr man Ra’ā, but the people abbreviated it and called it Sāmarrā’ Therein is the basement of the Jāmi‘ Maṣjid wherefrom the Shī‘ah claim that their Imām will emerge. (See: *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 3/173).

4 ‘Alī ibn Ṭā’ūs: *Miṣbāḥ al-Zā‘ir* p. 229; Muḥammad al-Mashhadī: *al-Mazār al-Kabīr* p. 216; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 102/102-103; al-Shīrāzī: *Kalimah al-Mahdī* p. 471-472.

Some narrations even suggest that with him in his occultation are thirty of his friends who are there to give him company in his solitude:

وما بثلاثين من وحشة

There is no solitude in the presence of thirty.¹

Specifically allocating prayers, communication, and seeking permission when visiting the basement smacks of what the fabricators of these narration wanted to give their followers the impression of his existence therein. Hence Ibn Khallikān says:

والشيعة ينتظرون خروجه في آخر الزمان من السرداب بسر من رأي

The Shī'ah anticipate his emergence at the end of time from the basement of Surr man Ra'ā.²

Likewise Ibn Athīr has mentioned that they believe that their Mahdī is hiding in the basement of Sāmarra'.³

Despite the glaring evidence in this regard a contemporary Shī'ī still claims that which is opposed to what is fact according to them. He says:

لم يرد خبر ولا وجد في كتاب من كتب الشيعة أن المهدي غاب في السرداب... ولا أنه عند ظهوره يخرج منه بل يكون خروجه بمكة ويباع بين الركن والمقام

No report has reached us nor is it mentioned in any of the books of the Shī'ah that the Mahdī disappeared in the basement nor that he will emerge therefrom. Rather he will remerge in Makkah and he will accept the allegiance of people between the *Rukn* (the pillar holding the black stone) and the *Maqām* (the stone holding the imprints of the feet of Ibrāhīm عليه السلام).⁴

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/340.

2 *Wafayāt al-A'yān* 4/176.

3 *Al-Kāmil* 5/373.

4 Muḥsin al-Amīn: *al-Burhān 'alā Wujūd Ṣāḥib al-Zamān* p. 102.

But, as we have seen, the practice of the Shī'ah is in complete contrast with this and is in harmony with what appears in their books of *Ziyārah* (visitation). For the Shī'ah, as asserted by Amīr 'Alī, would till the end of the fourteenth century of the common era, wherein Ibn Khaldūn compiled his magnanimous history, convene every night after the Maghrib Ṣalāh at the door of the basement of Sāmarrā' and would call out his name and induce him to make his appearance till the stars would become clearly visible, they would then return to their homes after a very long wait feeling crestfallen and despondent.¹

This wait was a reason for the Shī'ah being ridiculed by the mockers:

كلمتموه بجهلكم ما آنا	ما آن للسرداب أن يلد الذي
ثلثتم العنقاء والغيلانا	فعلي عقولكم العفاء فإنكم

The time has not come for the basement to produce the one you talk to out of your ignorance. Indeed it has not come.

Your minds have become rusty for surely you have provided a third for legendary birds and ghosts.²

Ibn Qayyim mentions:

ولقد أصبح هؤلاء عارا علي بني آدم وضحكة يسخر منهم كل عاقل

These people have become an indictment to humanity and a laughingstock for every intellectually sound person.³

It is for this reason that their prayers also smack of the fact that they have become victims of ridicule and disdain. Hence whilst addressing the awaited Mahdī each of them is required to say, “The anticipation has become long and the imposters have rejoiced at our condition.”⁴

1 Amīr 'Alī: *Rūḥ al-Islām* 1/210; see also: *Muqaddamah Ibn Khaldūn* 2/531-532; *al-Manār al-Munīf* p. 152.

2 *Al-Ṣawā'iq al-Muḥriqah* p. 168; *al-Manār al-Munīf* p. 152-153.

3 *Al-Manār al-Munīf* p. 152-153.

4 The narration has passed on this page first paragraph.

Some of their supplications suggest the confusion which has engulfed them regarding the hiding spot of the Mahdī. Hence they call him saying:

ليت شعري أين استقرت بك النوي، بل أي أرض تقلك أو ثري، أبرضوي أم غيرها أم ذي طوي

If I only I knew where distance has settled you, or which ground is holding you or which under land. Is it Raḍwā or another place, or is it Dhī Ṭawā?¹

Having said this, some of their narrations posit that the Mahdī is not in a steady place, rather he lives between the people, and he is present at the occasion of Ḥajj and sees the people but they cannot see him.²

This is how disparate their narrations are in stipulating his whereabouts; every group goes its own way based on the various Shīʿī families or based on different conditions and times, or of course till forging and misrepresenting continues.

It is no surprise that they have differed, because after all the Mahdī does not exist in the real world.

Furthermore, if his hiding spot was a matter that had to be concealed, his name was also concealed from his Shīʿah. From the endorsed letters of the Mahdī which the Bāb conveyed to the people one read as follows:

لو دلتهم علي الإسم لأذاعوه

If you inform them of the name they will popularise it.³

This narrations states that his name was unknown just as his place of residence and his birth and upbringing were unknown. In the Shīʿī narrations, however, his name appears as Muḥammad, but together with that the narrations prohibit calling him by his name. Hence in one narration the following appears:

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* p. 102-108.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/337-338; al-Nuʿmānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 116.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/333.

ولا يحل لكم ذكره باسمه

It is not permissible for you to make mention of him by his name.¹

Rather these narrations have dubbed a person who calls the Mahdī by his name a disbeliever. Hence a narration mentions:

صاحب هذا الأمر لا يسميه باسمه إلا كافر

The man of this matter, no one besides a disbeliever will call him by his name.²

Therefore you will find that when his name appears in their narrations they write each letter of his name separately as م ح د.³ And when they asked Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī as to how to mention him he said:

قولوا الحجة من آل محمد صلوات الله عليه وسلامه

Say the evidence from the family of Muḥammad ﷺ.⁴

In the ancient Shīʿī circles he was not known but with allusive names which were not known to anyone besides them, like *Gharīm* (responsible) for example. This is how al-Mufīd comments on this name by saying:

هذا رمز كانت الشيعة تعرفه قديما بينها ويكون خطابها عليه السلام - كذا - للتقية

This was an allusive name which the Shīʿah in the bygone era knew among themselves. The addressee of this name was the Mahdī ﷺ for reasons of Taqiyyah.⁵

1 Ibid. 1/333; *Al-Irshād* p. 394; *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 608.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/333; *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 607.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/329.

4 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/333; *Al-Irshād* p. 394.

5 *Al-Irshād* p. 400.

There were many allusive names which they gave to the Mahdī. To mention a few:

القائم، الخلف، السيد، الناحية المقدسة، الصاحب، صاحب الزمان، صاحب العصر، صاحب الأمر وغيرها

The upholder, the successor, the master, the sacred pillar, the person, the man of the time, the man of the era, and the man of the matter, etc.¹

A conspiracy of this magnitude suggests that there was a clandestine movement secretly operating in the Muslim world. The adherents whereof would choose to speak allusive language and communicate by way of hints in order to understand each other. Whilst at the same time it was an effort to conceal the falsehood and keep the reality hidden. Furthermore, it defies their claim that their Mahdī is mentioned by name and description.²

As to the period of his occultation, the inventors of this doctrine would give their followers false hopes of his emergence in the near future. So much so that they promised their followers that his occultation will not last for more than six years at worst. A narration of *al-Kāfī* which is allegedly reported from ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام states the following:

تكون له غيبة وحيرة يضل فيها أقوام ويهتدي فيها آخرون

There will be an occultation for him and a confusion. Many people will go astray during this time whilst many others will attain guidance.³

And when he was asked as to how long the occultation and the confusion would last he said:

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/333. One of their scholars is of the opinion that not clearly stating the name is specific of the era of fear and Taqiyyah (see: *al-Māzindarānī: Sharḥ al-Jāmi‘* 6/216-217).

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*: chapter regarding Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى emphatically appointing the Imāms one by one: 1/286, onwards.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/338.

Six days, six months, or six years.¹

It seems as if this narration was invented in the wake of the inception of the doctrine of occultation in order to placate the uneasy hearts and console the confused people who came to realise the truth when the Imām passed away without issue and when the deceit came to the fore, the reality becoming crystal clear. Hence they associated the doctrine of occultation with this report so that it may be plausible to accept and digest, and so that they may secure immediate wealth under the pretext of the Ahl al-Bayt which was to be ‘handed to the Mahdī’ as soon as he makes his appearance.

In the doctrines of *Badā’* and *Taqiyyah* there is enough room for interpretation and retraction of verdicts in the future. Hence this is what occurred to the later scholars of the Shī‘ah regarding this narration. For one of them avers:

يحتمل أن يكون المراد أن الغيبة والحيرة في ذلك القدر من الزمان أمر محتوم ويجري فيهما البدء بعد ذلك

Possibly what he meant was that the occultation and confusion during that period were bound to happen and thereafter *Badā’* can probably happen (i.e. it can occur to Allah otherwise and he can prolong the period).²

And others have tried to evade the issue with responses other than this,³ but no one dared question the validity of the doctrine of occultation itself.

1 Ibid.

2 Al-Māzindarānī: *Sharḥ al-Jāmi’* 6/237.

3 Some said, “Possibly he intended to confine the confusion to this period and not the occultation.” (Ibid) Whereas the confusion lasted alongside the occultation, as will become obvious to you from the books that have been compiled in this regard and from the fact that these books were written because of this very confusion and doubt which had engulfed many a people. (See: *Ikmāl al-Dīn* of Ibn Bābawayh p. 2).

Likewise some of their narrations suggest that the emergence will happen within seventy years from the occultation. Thereafter it was altered and changed to a hundred and forty years and then to an unknown period.¹ And they attributed to the Imāms that they could figure out the time of the emergence of the Mahdī from the *Ḥurūf Muqaṭṭa'āt* (disjoined letters) which appear in the beginning of the Sūrahs.²

What one gathers from their narrations is that the allusive language which kept Shī'ism going would give its adherents hope of the salvation and emergence of the hidden Mahdī in the near future, so much so that some of the Shī'ah would expect his emergence either now or then, i.e. at any time. Hence some of their narrations mention that among them some left business transactions and work out of eagerness for the emergence of the Mahdī and eventually they complained of their condition thus:

لقد تركنا أسواقنا انتظارا لهذا الأمر حتي ليوشك الرجل منا أن يسأل في يده

We left our markets in anticipation for this matter, to the extent that a person from among us can be asked regarding what remains in his possession.³

But as was mentioned previously, the underlying reason for all these types of promises was to keep their game going and to remove the suspicion of their followers and scepticism. This had always been their style, i.e. they sicken the Shī'ah with false hopes and confuse them with false promises. They have conceded this in their reports:

إن الشيعة تربى بالأمانى منذ مائتي سنة. و سبب ذلك أنه لو قيل لهم أن هذا الأمر لا يكون إلي مائتي سنة أو ثلاثمائة سنة لقسست القلوب ولرجعت عامة الناس عن الإسلام (يعني مذهبهم). ولكن قالوا ما أسرعه وما أقربه تألفا لقلوب الناس وتقريبا للفرج

1 See: *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* (coupled with its commentary of al-Māzindarānī) 6/314; al-Tūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 263; al-Nu'mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 197.

2 *Tafṣīr al-'Ayyāshī* 2/2; *al-Burhān* 2/3; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/106-109.

3 *Rawḍah al-Kāfi* 8/80; *'An Miftāḥ al-Kutub al-Arba'ah* 3/331.

The Shī'ah are growing based on false hopes since the last two centuries.¹ And the reason for this that if they are told that this matter is not going to materialise for the next two to three hundred years, the hearts of the people would become hard and they would denounce Islam (i.e. the Shī'ī conception of Islam). Instead they chose to tell them, "Very soon indeed," or "How near is his time," in order to win the hearts of the people and make the opening seem impending.²

Furthermore, the narrations which were invented to deal with the obvious predicament of specifying the timeframe of the occultation differ tremendously as well. Sometimes they demand submission and state:

إذا حدثناكم بحديث فجاء علي خلاف ما حدثناكم به فقولوا: صدق الله. وإذا حدثناكم بحديث فجاء علي خلاف ما حدثناكم به فقولوا: صدق الله. توجروا مرتين

When we communicate a tradition to you and the reality happens to materialise differently from what we told you, say, "Allah has spoken the truth." And when we communicate a tradition to you and the reality happens to materialise differently from what we told you, say, "Allah has spoken the truth." Your reward will be two fold.³

Sometimes the blame for their promises about the Mahdī failing to come to pass is put squarely upon the Shī'ah, for having divulged his secret. For example, one of them says:

ما لهذا الأمر أمد ينتهي إليه ويريح أبداننا. قال بلي: ولكنكم أذعتم فأخره الله

"Is there no time limit for this matter at which it will end and cause us comfort?"

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/369; *al-Nu'mānī: al-Ghaybah* p. 198; *al-Ṭūsī: al-Ghaybah* p. 207-208; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/102. The narration is allegedly reported by 'Alī al-Riḍā.

2 *Ibid.*

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/369; *al-Nu'mānī: al-Ghaybah* p. 197; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/118.

The Imām said, “Definitely! But Allah prolonged the period because you divulged the secret.”¹

Other narrations state:

إن الله تبارك وتعالى قد كان وقت هذا الأمر... إلي أربعين ومائة. فحدثناكم فأدعتم الحديث فكشفتم قناع الستر ولم يجعل الله له بعد ذلك وقتا عندنا

Allah ﷻ had stipulated a time for this matter, a hundred and forty, but when we communicated that to you, you spread the information and divulged the secret subsequent to which Allah ﷻ did not stipulate any time for him.²

Sometimes they attribute it to the martyrdom of Ḥusayn. Abū ‘Abd Allāh³ is reported to have said:

إن الله تبارك وتعالى قد كان وقت هذا الأمر في السبعين فلما أن قتل الحسين صلوات الله عليه اشتد غضب الله تعالى علي أهل الأرض فأخره

Allah ﷻ had stipulated a time for this matter within seventy years,⁴ however, when Ḥusayn عليه السلام was martyred Allah’s ﷻ anger intensified upon the people of the earth so he prolonged it.⁵

And they incooperate all of this in the doctrine of Badā’. That is why al-Māzindarānī says:

1 Al-Nu’mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 194; al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* 263; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/117.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/368; al-Nu’mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 197; al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 263; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/117.

3 Obviously the doctrine of occultation only came about after the demise of Ja’far, but the Shī’ah attribute narrations regarding it to all the Imāms.

4 The commentator of *al-Kāfī* says, “Apparently seventy years from the time of occultation (al-Māzindarānī: *Sharḥ al-Jāmi’* 6/314).

5 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/368; al-Nu’mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 197; al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 263; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/117.

توقيت ظهور هذا الأمر... توقيت بدائي فلذلك جري فيه البدء

The time stipulation of this matter is one related to Badā' and hence Badā' happened therein.¹

And, lastly, at times they disregard the narrations of the time limitations completely. Some narrations state:

كذب الوقتون، وهلك المستعجلون ونجا المسلمون

The time stipulators have lied, the hasteners are doomed, and the Muslims are saved.²

And:

كذب الوقتون. إنا أهل البيت لا نوقت

The time stipulators have lied; we the Ahl al-Bayt do not stipulate times.³

Likewise:

ما وقتنا فيما مضى ولا نوقت فيما يستقبل

We did not stipulate a time in the past, nor will we stipulate a time in the future.⁴

Similarly:

من وقت لك من الناس شيئا فلا تهاين أن تكذبه فلسنا نوقت لأحد وقتا

1 *Sharḥ al-Jāmi'* 6/314; al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 263-264.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/368; al-Nu'mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 198; al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 262; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/103-104.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/368; al-Nu'mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 198.

4 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 262; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/103.

Whoever stipulates a time from you from the people, do not be afraid of belying him because we do not stipulate a time for anyone.¹

And lastly:

أبي الله إلا أن يخالف وقت الموقتين

Allah has refused but to violate the time of the time stipulators.²

This is how their narrations differ and contradict one another. Simply because forging happens based on conditions and occasions.

As to reason of his occultation, the following narration appears in *al-Kāfī* from Zurārah:

سمعت أبا عبد الله يقول: إن للقائم عليه السلام غيبة قبل أن يقوم. قلت: ولم؟ قال: إنه يخاف - وأوماً بيده إلى بطنه - يعني القتل

I heard Abū ‘Abd Allāh saying, “The Mahdī عجل الله فرجه will go into occultation before he assumes power.”

I asked, “Why?”

He said, “He will fear,” and pointing toward his stomach he said, “Murder.”³

There are many other narrations of this sort.⁴ Al-Ṭūsī has confirmed this reason in his following statement:

لا علة تمنع من ظهوره إلا خوفه علي نفسه من القتل. لأنه لو كان غير ذلك لما ساء له الاستتار وكان يتحمل المشاق والأذى. فإن منازل الأئمة وكذلك الأنبياء عليهم السلام إنما تعظم لتحملهم المشاق العظيمة في ذات الله تعالى

1 Al-Nu‘mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 195; al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 262; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/104.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/368; al-Nu‘mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 198.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/338; al-Nu‘mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 118; *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 449.

4 See: *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/327, 340; al-Nu‘mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 118; *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 449.

There is no reason that prevents him from emerging besides his fear for being killed. For if it were due to any other reason he would not have went into occultation and he would have underwent difficulties and harassment. This is because the only reason the Imāms and likewise the Ambiyā' enjoy such lofty positions is due to their perseverance upon difficulties for the pleasure of Allah ﷻ.¹

However, this rationale which Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifāh confirms, is inconceivable regarding the Imāms, based on what the Shī'ah believe about them. Since according to them “the Imāms know when death will overtake them and they do not die but by their own choice”, as is approved by al-Kulaynī in *al-Kāfī* in many narrations. In fact the name of the chapter wherein he cites these narrations is the same as above.² Al-Majlisī has also established the same in his *Biḥār al-Anwār* and he has established a chapter by the title, *Chapter regarding them knowing when they going to die and that death will not occur but with their choice*.³ So how do they solve this contradiction?⁴

Similarly, the Shī'ah believe that the Imām has knowledge of what happened and what is to happen, nothing is concealed from them,⁵ as is established by al-Kulaynī in a chapter which goes by the same title. So it was within the capacity of the Imāms to avoid danger better than anyone else.

Furthermore, why were none of the four vicegerents—who claimed to have first-hand contact with the Imām—killed despite them not being like the Imāms in terms of them not dying when they decide to?

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah*: chapter regarding the reason preventing the Mahdī from emerging p. 199.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/258.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/285.

4 I referred to al-Māzindarānī's commentary of *al-Kāfī* in order to see how he explains the narrations which mention the reason for his occultation as being the fear to be killed... But he avoids making any comments on them and passes clean.

5 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/260.

Likewise, there was ample amnesty for the Imām to make his appearance after the establishment of many Shīʿī states, why did he not make his appearance then so that the people may be relieved by his emergence and benefit from his knowledge, his weaponry, and his strength. And later, after the fall of those states he could go back into occultation. Aḥmad al-Kisrawī, therefore, states:

إذا كان منتظرهم قد اختفي لخوفه علي نفسه فلم لم يظهر عندما استولي آل بويه الشيعة علي بغداد وصيروا بني العباس طوع أمهرم. فلم لم يظهر عندما قام الشاه إسماعيل الصفوي وأجري من دماء السنين أنهاراً؟ فلم لم يظهر عندما كان كريمخان الزندي وهو من أكبر سلاطين إيران يضرب علي السكة اسم أمامكم ويعد نفسه وكيلا عنه؟ وبعد فلم لا يظهر اليوم وقد د الشيعة مليوناً وأكثرهم من منتظره.

If their awaited Imām went into occultation due to fear then why did not make his appearance when the Buyid dynasty took over Baghdad and subjugated the Abbasid rulers? And why did he not emerge when the Safawid Shah Ismāʿīl arose and made bloody rivers flow with the blood of the Sunnīs? And why did he not appear when Karīm Khān al-Zandī, who was considered to be one of the greatest monarchs of Iran, would engrave the name of your Imām upon the currency and would consider himself his vicegerent? And even today when the amount of the Shīʿah has reached sixty million, all waiting his return, he has not made his appearance.¹

Likewise today, after the era of al-Kisrawī, when the state of the scholars is well established he has still not come out to them, despite their earnest prayers and seeking help from him since the bygone centuries.

Conversely, some narrations assert that the reason for his occultation was to test the hearts of the Shīʿah. This reasoning which those narrations portray probably was an attempt to mitigate the doubt which had crept into the hearts of the Shīʿah, because this doctrine had not found a way into the minds of many of the Shīʿah which ultimately led them to denouncing Shīʿism entirely.

1 *Al-Tashayyu' wa al-Shīʿah* p. 42.

The Shī'ah were similarly tired of waiting for the hidden Imām, to the extent that one of them said:

قد طال هذا الأمر علينا حتي ضاقت قلوبنا ومتنا كمدًا

This matter has become too long for us to bear, our hearts are grieved and we are dying out of exasperation.¹

The gloomy clouds of doubt and suspicion which had enveloped the Shī'ah was attested to by their scholar Ibn Bābawayh after his visit to Nīsābūr:

رجعت إلي نيسابور وأقمت فيها فوجدت أكثر المختلفين علي من الشيعة قد حيرتهم الغيبة ودخلت عليهم في أمر القائم عليه السلام الشبهة

I visited Nīsābūr and stayed there. I found that the majority of the people who visited me from the Shī'ah were gripped in confusion regarding the occultation and they were having doubts about the matter of the Mahdī.²

Their narrations, which were invented to treat this problem, sketch the confusion of the Shī'ah regarding the matter of the Mahdī, his prolonged occultation and inaccessibility of any information regarding him. The following narration appears in *al-Kāfī*:

عن زرارة قال: سمعت أبا عبد الله يقول: إن للغلام غيبة قبل أن يقوم... وهو المنتظر وهو الذي يشك في ولادته. منهم من يقول: مات أبوه بلا خلف ومنهم من يقول: حمل ومنهم من يقول: إنه ولد قبل موت أبيه بستين وهو المنتظر، غير أن الله عز وجل يحب أن يمتحن الشيعة فعند ذلك يرتاب المبطلون

Zurārah said, "I heard Abū 'Abd Allāh saying, "There will be an occultation for the boy before he takes charge... He will be the awaited Mahdī and regarding his birth there will be doubt. Some will say, "His father died without issue." And some will say, "He was conceived." Whilst others will

1 Al-Nu'mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 120.

2 *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 2.

say, “He was born two years before the death of his father and he is the awaited.” But Allah ﷻ loves to test the Shī‘ah. Hence at that trying time the deniers will doubt.¹

So this variance of opinion, according to them, was a test for the Shī‘ah. The books of heresiography have recorded that this exactly what had happened to them after the demise of Ḥasan al-‘Askarī, as has passed. So this narration and others of its type were seemingly forged to treat the confusion and doubt which had engulfed them after the demise of their Imām without issue. Hence we find plenty narrations which are along the same lines and which sketch the reality of the Shī‘ah very clearly. The following narration appears in *al-Kāfī*:

لا والله لا يكون ما تمدون إليه أعينكم حتي تغربلوا. لا والله لا يكون ما تمدون إليه أعينكم حتي تمحصوا.
لا والله لا يكون ما تمدون إليه أعينكم حتي تميزوا. لا والله لا يكون ما تمدون إليه أعينكم إلا بعد إياس.
لا والله لا يكون ما تمدون إليه أعينكم حتي يشقي من يشقي ويسعد من يسعد.

No, by Allah, that to which you raise your gazes will not happen till you are not sifted. No, by Allah, that to which you raise your gazes will not happen till you are not purified. No, by Allah, that to which you raise your gazes will not happen till you are not separated. No, by Allah, that to which you raise your gazes will not happen but after you lose hope. No, by Allah, that to which you raise your gazes will not happen till the wretched become wretched and the fortunate become fortunate.²

So they claim that the anxiety which gripped them due to the occultation of the Mahdī was due to purifying and testing them. Once that was done the Mahdī would return. They have attributed the following to Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq:

أنه دخل عليه بعض أصحابه وهو يبكي كالنكلي، لأنه نظر في كتاب الجفر المشتمل علي علم البلايا
والمنايا وعلم ما كان وما يكون إلي يوم القيامة فقال: تأملت فيه مولد قائمنا عليه السلام وغيبته وأبطاءه
وطول عمي وبلوي المؤمنين من بعده في ذلك الزمان. وتولد الشكوك في قلوب الشيعة من طول غيبته
وارتداد أكثرهم عن دينه

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/337.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/370.

A student of his visited him and he was crying like a bereaved woman because he (allegedly) had a look at the goat skin book which contained the knowledge of calamities and deaths and the knowledge of what happened and what was to happen till the Day of Judgment and said, "I contemplated in it the birth of our Mahdī, his occultation, his delayed arrival, the confusion, and test of the believers thereafter, the creeping of doubts into the hearts of the Shī'ah owing to his prolonged absence and the apostasy of majority of them from his creed..."¹

This narration which is allegedly attributed to Ja'far talks of the apostasy of many of the Shī'ah due to the occultation which was becoming too long. This narration, like others, was invented after this problem had already engulfed them in order to encourage them to remain within Shī'ism by claiming that this was a reality which the Imāms foretold and it is one of the signs of the return of the absent Imām.

Their scholar al-Nu'mānī of the third century who lived in the early period of the Shī'ah inception attested to this, so his attestation in this regard is of utmost importance. He attested to the doubts the Shī'ah were experiencing at that time besides a few:

فإننا رأينا طوائف من العصاة المنسوبة إلى التشيع المنتمية إلى نبينا محمد وآله صلى الله عليهم ممن يقول بالإمامة... قد تفرقت كلمتها وتشعبت مذاهبها واستهانت بفرائض الله عز وجل وخفت إلى محارم الله تعالى فطال بعضهم غلوا وانخفض بعضهم تقصيرا وشكوا جميعا إلا القليل في إمام زمانهم وولي أمرهم وحجة ربهم... للمحنة الواقعة بهذه الغيبة

We have seen many groups who are affiliated to Shī'ism, to Muḥammad ﷺ and his household, who believe in Imāmah, their unity has been shattered, their stances have diversified. They have disregarded the injunctions of Allah and stepped into the prohibitions of Allah. Some of them have steeped into extremism whilst others into negligence. They have all, besides a few, doubted the Imām of their time, the guardian

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 105-106.

of their affairs and the evidence of their lord due to the test which this occultation imposes.¹

The anarchy had reached a level where they started insulting, disowning, and excommunicating one another, as the narration of al-Nu'mānī portrays:

لا يكون الأمر الذي ينتظر حتي يبرأ بعضكم من بعض ويتنفل بعضكم في وجوه بعض فيشهد بعضكم علي بعض بالكفر ويلعن بعضكم بعضا

The matter that is anticipated will not come to being till you do not denounce each other, some of you spit in the faces of others, some attest to the disbelief of others, and you curse each other.²

This narration portrays this grave phenomenon as good because it foretells the coming of the Mahdī. It says:

الخير كله في ذلك الزمان يقوم قائمنا ويدفع ذلك كله

All good will prevail in that time. Our Mahdī will take charge of affairs and repel all of this.³

From these narrations it seems as if the Ḥadīth scholars of the Shī'ah forged these narrations and attributed them to the Ahl al-Bayt in an event to combat this devastating phenomenon. They filled the content of these narrations with the alleged purification, the test, and apostasy which was going the way of the Shī'ah in order to encourage them to remain within Twelver Shī'ism.

Despite all these testimonies and acknowledgements, the doctrine of occultation which the Shī'ah were compelled to believe in caused great upheaval which had the potential to destroy it from its very basis in the Shī'ī circles. Despite all of this they still say:

1 Al-Nu'mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 11.

2 Ibid. p. 137-138; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/114-115.

3 Al-Nu'mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 138; *Biḥār al-Anwār* p. 115.

لم علم الله أنهم يرتابون ما خيب الله حجته طرفه عين

If Allah knew that they would be uneasy he would not have disappointed his evidence even for the winking of an eye.¹

Can there be any uneasiness worse than the doubting of the majority with the exception of a few and disunity and mutual imprecation.

The excessive belying of Shī'ah of the doctrine of occultation is clearly noticeable in these narrations, especially in its stages of development. Perhaps the reason for this was that the falsehood thereof had become manifest to the people who had lived in its era and witnessed the condition which gave birth to it. And hence the architects of this belief rose to block those gaps wherefrom the winds of doubts would blow, and those niches wherefrom the falsity thereof would become evident. So they treated the factual phenomena of refutation, imprecation, and division by forging narrations which primarily communicated the happening of these phenomena as a glad tiding for the near and imminent arrival of the Mahdī. However, all these phenomena ensued and the Mahdī still did not make his appearance. Likewise they treated what had reached the Shī'ah regarding the family of Ḥasan belying the doctrine in question by forging narrations which stated that "The Mahdī will go into occultation and his family will deny it," and when Zurārah, the person to whom this narration is falsely attributed² asked as to the reason for this denial Abū Ja'far said, "They will fear." And he pointed to his stomach.³

Likewise another niche wherefrom this doctrine could easily be denied was the fact that the family of Ḥasan, nor anyone else, knew of his birth and his upbringing. Hence they forged narrations such as:

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/333; *al-Nu'mānī: al-Ghaybah* p. 107.

2 Because he passed away before the doctrine of occultation came into existence.

3 *Al-Nu'mānī: al-Ghaybah* p. 188.

يبعث الله لهذا الأمر غلاماً منا خفي الولادة والمنشأ

Allah ﷻ will send a boy from amongst us for this matter. His birth and upbringing will be unknown.¹

If someone has to study these narrations from this perspective he will definitely be gripped by surprise.

Furthermore, on the other hand they forged narrations which glorified the anticipation of the Mahdī and stated that it is the best of actions. This was to repel the anxiety of such a profoundly prolonged existence and the despondency and deprivation which was beginning to creep into the hearts of the people. This can be gaged from the following narration of *al-Kāfī*:

أقرب ما يكون العباد من الله جل ذكره وأرضي ما يكون عنهم إذا افتقدوا حجة الله جل وعز ولم يظهر لهم ولم يعلموا مكانه وهم في ذلك يعلمون أنه لم تبطل حجة الله جل ذكره ولا ميثاقه. فعندها فتوقعوا الفرج صباحاً ومساءً

The closest the bondsmen can ever be to Allah and the most happiest Allah can ever be with them is when they anticipate the evidence of Allah and he does emerge to them nor do they know of his whereabouts. But they are confident that the evidence of Allah and his promise have not been violated. When this happens, then wait for relief, either in the morning or the evening.²

In this narration they have made the occultation a sign of relief being imminent, whereas today more than a thousand and a hundred years have passed to the occultation have passed and none of these promises have come to being. So what impression will these narrations leave in a person who reads these empty hopes of the Shī'ah? Will not the doubt increase in his heart till he eventually will leave the fold of Islam and search for another religion purely because he is deceptively told that this Mahdī is unanimously accepted by the Sunnīs and the Shī'ah?

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/341-342; *al-Nu'mānī*: *al-Ghaybah* p. 112.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/333; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/145.

They have many other narrations regarding the doctrine of anticipation, al-Majlisī has cited 77 narrations under a chapter which he has titled, *Chapter regarding the virtues of anticipation and praising the Shī'ah during the era of occultation and what is to be done in it.*¹ To the extent that they even forged a narration and attributed it to Rasūl Allah ﷺ:

أفضل إعمال أمتي انتظار فرج الله عزوجل

The best deed of my Ummah is to wait for relief from Allah ﷻ.²

They have made anticipation the most beloved action to Allah and the people who anticipate the best people of every era,³ and they claim that Rasūl Allah ﷺ told his companions:

سيأتي قوم من بعدكم الرجل الواحد منهم له أجر خمسين منكم. قالوا يا رسول الله نحن كنا معك ببدر وأحد وحنين ونزل فينا القرآن فقال: إنكم لو تحملوا ما حملوا لم تصبروا صبرهم.

“A people will come after you, the reward of one person among them will be equal to that of fifty among you.”

They asked, “O Rasūl Allāh! We were with you in Badr, Uḥud, and Ḥunayn; and regarding us the Qur’ān would come down.”

He said, “If you were tested as they will be, you would not be able to persevere as they will.”⁴

The status of the Ṣaḥābah, according to the Shī'ah, clearly did not occur to the forger of this narration.

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/122-150; see also: *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 603, onwards.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/122.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.

Likewise there are narrations which mitigate the anxiety the Shī'ah have to see the emergence of the Mahdī, hence one narration states:

من عرف هذا الأمر ثم مات قبل أن يقوم القائم عليه السلام كان له مثل أجر من قتل معه

The one who acknowledged this matter and then passed away before the emergence of the Mahdī will receive the reward of those who will be martyred with him.¹

Coupled with these rewards on one hand, on the other hand there are narrations which threaten with excommunication and eternity in Jahannam any person who denies the occultation of the Mahdī, to the extent that they have equated it to denying the prophethood of Nabī Muḥammad ﷺ. Rather they have considered it to be equivalent to the disbelief of Iblīs. Al-Ṣadūq narrates the following with his alleged chain of transmission from Abū Ya'fūr:

عن أبي يعفور قال: قال أبو عبد الله عليه السلام: من أقر بالأئمة من آبائي وولدي وجحد المهدي من ولدي كان كمن أقر بجميع الأنبياء وجحد محمدا صلي الله عليه وآله. فقلت يا سيدي: ومن المهدي من ولدك؟ قال الخامس من ولد السابع يغيب عنهم شخصه ولا يحل لهم تسميته

Abū 'Abd Allāh said, "That person who acknowledges the Imāms from my forefathers and children and denies the Mahdī of my progeny is like a person who acknowledges all the Ambiyā' and denies the Muḥammad ﷺ."

So I asked, "O my master, who is the Mahdī of your progeny?"

He said, "The fifth from the children of the seventh, he will disappear from them and it will not be permissible for them to mention him by name."²

They have also allegedly attributed the following to Rasūl Allah ﷺ:

1 Ibid. 52/130.

2 *Ikmal al-Dīn* p. 288.

من أنكر القائم من ولدي فقد أنكرني

The one who denies the Mahdī of my progeny is like the one who denies me.¹

And al-Ṣadūq said:

مثل من أنكر القائم عليه السلام في غيبته مثل إبليس في امتناعه في السجود لآدم

The one who denies the Mahdī in his absence is like the Iblīs in his denial to prostrate before Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام.²

Furthermore, the doctrine of occultation has, because of the scholars of the Shī'ah, become a source of enmity for the Ṣaḥābah and those who followed them diligently. Their scholar al-Jazā'irī said:

إني كلما أشكلت علي مسألة أوجبت علي نفسي لعنهم لأنهم سبب في استتار الحجة

Whenever I find it difficult to understand an issue I make it compulsory for myself to curse the Ṣaḥābah because they were the cause of the evidence going into occultation.³

As you can see, they are trying to channel the resentment and the enmity which is seated deep down in their hearts due to their embittered anticipation of the Mahdī who is defeated, subdued, and contested in his rightful position,⁴ and due to the Shī'ah being victims of bloodshed and looting at the hands of the enemies of Allah.⁵ Thus the avenue that they choose to channel this resentment is the best generation ever known to humanity and those who followed them.

1 Ibid. p. 390; Luṭf Allah al-Ṣāfi: *Muntakhab al-Athar* p. 492.

2 *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 13.

3 *Sharḥ al-Ṣaḥīfah al-Sajjādiyyah* p. 37.

4 *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 12.

5 Ibid.

Evidence for the Occurrence of the Ghaybah

The Twelvers have given a lot of importance to establish the validity of the occultation of the Mahdī by way of evidence. In their search for evidence they focused on the book of Allah ﷻ, but when they did not find what they wanted they contrived, as is their wont, esoteric interpretations of the verses thereof which are filled with stark artificiality and immense exaggeration, they have interpreted many verses of the Qur’ān in this manner.

The following appears in the most seminal book of the Shī‘ah in Qur’ānic exegesis, *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, regarding the verse:

وَالنَّهَارِ إِذَا تَجَلَّى

And [by] the day when it appears.¹

النهار هو القائم منا أهل البيت

He said, “The day is the Mahdī from amongst us the Ahl al-Bayt.”²

In the most authentic work from their four early canonical works, the following appears regarding the verse:

قُلْ أَرَأَيْتُمْ إِنْ أَصْبَحَ مَاؤُكُمْ غَوْرًا فَمَنْ يَأْتِيكُمْ بِمَاءٍ مَّعِينٍ

Say, “Have you considered: if your water was to become sunken [into the earth], then who could bring you flowing water?”³

إذا غاب عنكم إمامكم فمن يأتيكم بإمام جديد

1 Sūrah al-Layl: 2

2 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/425.

3 Sūrah al-Mulk: 30

He said, “If your Imām goes away from you, who can bring a new Imām for you.”¹

And in *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* the following is reported regarding the verse:

وَأَذَانٌ مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَرَسُولِهِ إِلَى النَّاسِ يَوْمَ الْحَجِّ الْأَكْبَرِ

And [it is] an announcement from Allah and His Messenger to the people on the day of the greater pilgrimage.²

خروج القائم وأذان دعوته إلي نفسه

He said, “This is the emergence of the Mahdī and his call of invitation to himself.”³

There are numerous examples of this type of narrations, to the extent that some of them have compiled books on this topic, for example: *Mā Nazl Min al-Qur’ān Fī Ṣāḥib al-Zamān* (that which has been revealed of the Qur’ān regarding the man of the time)⁴ and *al-Maḥajjah Fīmā Nazl Fī al-Qā’im al-Ḥujjah* (the straight path regarding that which came down regarding the Mahdī, the evidence).⁵ The latter was published recently⁶ with the revision of a contemporary Shī’ī scholar.⁷ In it the author has interpreted more than a hundred and twenty verses of the Qur’ān with their awaited Mahdī, all of which are undoubtedly from their flaws which cannot be concealed. Amazingly, the reviser of the book was not satisfied with this amount, so he added another twelve verses to it from the Book of Allah *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى* and he attached them at to the end of the book under the title ‘Addendum of the Evidence’.

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/339. See also: *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/76; *Ikmal al-Dīn* p. 239; *al-Burhān* 2/102.

2 *Sūrah al-Tawbah*: 3

3 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/76; *al-Burhān* 2/102.

4 The book of ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Jalūdī (see: *al-Dharī‘ah* 19/30).

5 The book of Hāshim al-Baḥrānī.

6 It was published in 1403 A.H. by Mu’sasah al-Wafā’ in Beirut.

7 He goes by the name Muḥammad Munīr al-Maylānī. He has referenced the narrations of the book to a substantial number of their reliable works.

An impartial and objective study of these esoteric interpretations whereby substantiation for the doctrine of occultation is intended clearly reveals that they entail colossal exaggeration and distortion of the Book of Allah ﷻ, therein there is no evidence whatsoever. It also reveals the invalidity of this doctrine which they are trying to establish from its 'origins'.

Likewise the Shī'ah tend to seek evidence from the absence/disappearance of the Ambiyā' عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام in order to prove the validity of the occultation of their Mahdī. So, for example:

- They draw evidence from the incident of Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام escaping from his homeland in order to be saved from the Pharaoh and his people, as is mentioned in the Qur'ān,
- From the story of Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and the information of his whereabouts being concealed from his father, till eventually Allah ﷻ disclosed his whereabouts and united him with his father and brothers, which is also mentioned in a chapter of the Qur'ān,
- From the story of Yūnus ibn Mattā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام with his people when he left them after their adamancy in opposing him and their violation of his rights; he went away from them and from everyone else to the extent that none of the creation knew of his abode; Allah ﷻ concealed him and kept him alive through his wisdom till a certain period had lapsed where after Allah returned him to his people and united him with them.¹

They likewise draw evidence from the hiding of our Nabī Muḥammad ﷺ in the cave. Al-Ṭūsī has produced this incident as evidence against those who object by saying, "If your Imām is responsible of up-keeping the order of Allah and bearing the burden of Imāmah, then how could he have disappeared?"² He says:

أليس النبي صلي الله عليه وسلم قد اختفي في الشعب ثلاث سنين لم يصل إليه أحد واختفي في الغار
ثلاثة أيام

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 77.

2 Ibid. p. 13.

Did not Nabī ﷺ disappear in the valley for a period of three years wherein no one had access to him and did he not hide in the cave for three days?¹

However, the reality is that these similarities that the Shī'ah draw in trying to convince their followers and those who doubt the doctrine of the occultation do not in any way help in extirpating the doubt which is embedded in the hearts of the people, which continues to perplex them wherever they ponder over it. To the extent that Ibn Bābawayh had written a book in order to convince one of their senior scholars who was doubting the doctrine, and likewise to convince those who were always around him who were who were also victims of doubt and confusion, as he has indicated in his book.²

I reiterate, these similarities are of no benefit in establishing the doctrine of the occultation for many reasons, one being the following: regarding the disappearance of Mūsā, 'Īsā, Yūnus, Yūsuf, and Muḥammad ﷺ³ Allah ﷻ has informed us in the Qur'ān with clear and emphatic verses wherein there is no confusion and intricacy. As opposed to the occultation of the their Mahdī, for the narrations in that regard end at Ḥakīmah (that is if the attribution of them to her is correct) and the four Bābs whose eligibility for attestation is dubious due to them vesting in their interests, i.e. focusing on amassing excessive wealth. Therefore, we find that many claimed to be the Bāb.

Another reason is that the disappearance of the Ambiyā' ﷺ was known to their people because they had previously stayed among them. As for their Mahdī, no one knew him, nor did anyone see any trace of him, so much so that his own family denied his existence, as is attested to by reliable historians that al-Ḥasan al-'Askarī died without issue.

1 Ibid.

2 *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 2-4.

3 As for the three years in the valley of Abū Ṭālib, that was a boycott and not a disappearance, so it is unrelated to our topic.

Furthermore, the disappearance of the Ambiyāʾ عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام was for a specific time and to a specific place. They went away for a while and then returned to their people and families.

Likewise, the Messengers of Allah ﷺ who disappeared for a while established the evidence of Allah ﷻ against their people and conveyed his message to their generation, as opposed to their Mahdī upon whom many generations have passed but we have not heard anything about him.

In addition, the disappearance of the Ambiyāʾ was due to natural reasons. For example, Yūsuf's ﷺ disappearance was due to the separation from his father Yaʿqūb ﷺ and his travel to a distant land, which is just like a person who travels from one city to another. It was limited to a specific time. All of their disappearance was exceptional, for despite them being a lot in number it only happened to a few of them.

As for the substantiation of the Shīʿah from the hiding of Nabī ﷺ in the cave for three days, it is incongruous. Because the hiding of Nabī ﷺ was not in order to conceal his prophethood, but a strategy deployed in adverse conditions, so that the disbelievers do not prove to be an impediment in his progress. Likewise, he only went into hiding for three days. So justifying the occultation of their Mahdī based on his situation is very foolish. Simply because there is a very big difference between disappearing for three days which served as a preamble for the victory and dominance of dīn and between going into occultation for an abnormally extended period of time, the result of which is helplessness, the discarding of propagation, and the proliferation of tyranny.¹

How the Shīʿah Justify the Prolonged Period of the Occultation:

One of the many reasons whereby the false claim of the Shīʿah regarding the existence of their Imām can be discerned is the improbability of him being alive after almost a thousand and a hundred years have passed since his occultation.

¹ *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* p. 119.

Since such a prolonged life for a Muslim is something the falsehood of which can be picked up by the prevalent system of Allah regarding the Ummah of Muḥammad ﷺ, i.e. no one is known to have lived for a hundred and twenty years during the era of Islam, let alone living for the aforementioned period of time. It appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* that Rasūl Allah ﷺ said the following regarding the end of his life:

أُرأيْتكم ليلتكم هذه فإن علي رأس مائة سنة منها لا يبقى علي وجه الأرض ممن هو اليوم عليها أحد

Do you notice this night of yours, none of the people who are upon the surface of the earth today will remain after hundred years have passed on it.¹

Hence whoever at that time was one year of age did not live for more than a hundred years without a doubt. And if the ages of people did not exceed this limit in those times, then the times to follow thereafter would more so entail this prevalent norm. Likewise the ages of the members of this Ummah are between sixty and seventy; very few people actually exceed that,² as is established in an authentic narration.³

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/65. See the narration in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: chapter of knowledge: sub-chapter regarding discussing academic issues at night: 1/37; *Musnad Aḥmad* 1/121, 131.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/165. See the narration in *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*: Chapter of Zuhd: Sub-chapter regarding the ending of the lives of people between sixty and seventy years: 4/566, Chapter regarding Du‘ā’: sub-chapter regarding the Du‘ā’ of Nabī ﷺ 5/553. Commenting of the narration al-Tirmidhī says, “This narration is sound but only transmitted with one transmission; it is only known with this transmission.” Ibn Ḥajr commenting on this says, “It is strange of him to say that, because he himself has narrated the narration in the chapter of Zuhd with another chain of transmission from Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه. (See: *Fayḍ al-Qadīr* 2/11). *Sunan Ibn Mājah*: chapter of Zuhd: sub-chapter regarding hopes and death: 2/1415; *Fayḍ al-Qadīr* 2/11: the narration of Abū Ḥayyān; *Mustadrak Ḥākim* 2/427; al-Khaṭīb: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 6/397, 12/48; al-Suyūṭī: *al-Jāmi’ al-ṣaghīr* p. 48: he has classified it to be Ḥasan, sound; Ibn Ḥajr has labelled it sound as well (see: *Fayḍ al-Qadīr* 2/11); Ḥākim has dubbed it authentic and in accordance with the requirements of Muslim, and al-Dhahabī has agreed with him (*al-Mustadrak* 2/427); al-Albānī has commented thusly, “It is Ḥasan Li Dhātihi and Ṣaḥīḥ li Ghayrihi” i.e. sound but not authentic. (*Silsilah al-Aḥādīth al-Ṣaḥīḥah* 2/397; al-Albānī: *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Jāmi’* 1/354).

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/165.

This objection sort of strangles the Shī'ah and extirpates their dogma. The Shī'ah scholars have tried to dispel it by again drawing similarities between their Mahdī and some of the Ambiyā' عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ whose lives extended over the average ages of people. Hence the Mahdī, according, them is like Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ who stayed amongst his people for 950 years.¹ They have attributed this juxtaposition to some of the Ahl al-Bayt in order to lend it some credence. Hence Ibn Bābawayh has narrated the following with his chain of transmission to 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn:

في القائم سنة من نوح عليه السلام وهو طول العمر

In the Mahdī there is a trait of Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and that is prolonged age.²

Likewise, they say that the prolonged life of the Mahdī is like that of 'Īsā ibn Maryam, Khid̄ar, and Ilyās عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ.³ They also draw a comparison between him and Iblīs.⁴ They attribute a good few of these comparisons to the Ahl al-Bayt in order to blow within them the status of certainty for their followers, giving them the impression that they are the verdicts of the infallibles.⁵ They likewise seek evidence in the abnormally long lives of some humans.⁶ The only comparison that they forgot to make is between him and Jibrīl and Mikā'īl عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ and all the angels of the heavens and the earth.

But the Shī'ah themselves destroy this argument by asserting that their Mahdī is the legitimate ruler of the Ummah for the past eleven centuries or more, he is the safeguarder of the Qur'ān without who it cannot be understood and without who there is no guidance for the humans therein, he possess the entire Qur'ān, the manuscript of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا thereof, the goat skin — the *Jāmi'ah* and everything else that the Ummah needs in their worldly and religious affairs. Considering

1 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 79.

2 *Ikmal al-Dīn* p. 488.

3 'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah p. 108.

4 Al-Ḥā'irī: *Ilzām al-Nāṣib* 1/283.

5 See: *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/336-337; al-Nu'mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 108, onwards; *Ikmal al-Dīn* p. 134; *Ilzām al-Nāṣib* 1/285.

6 Al-Ṭūsī: *Al-Ghaybah* p. 79, onwards.

this, their Mahdī is responsible for the Ummah, and with him are all the means of their good fortune in this world and the hereafter. As for those prophets and humans by way of who they support their arguments, they are very different than the ‘Mahdī. For example: Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ stayed amongst his people for nine hundred and fifty years, inviting them till Allah سُبحانه وتعالى revealed to him:

لَنْ يُؤْمِنَ مِنْ قَوْمِكَ إِلَّا مَنْ قَدْ آمَنَ

No one will believe from your people except those who have already believed.¹

He did not disappear into a cave in a way that no one had knowledge of his whereabouts; or in a way that he would see the people going astray but he would go away from them and they would thus not see him for ages and centuries. Not forgetting that the age of the Mahdī has now even exceeded the age of Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. Similarly, ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ conveyed the message of Allah سُبحانه وتعالى to his people, established the evidence against them, and fulfilled the trust he was entrusted with before being raised to the heavens. Hence his disappearance did not in no way impact upon his followers, as opposed to the their Mahdī who disappeared since his childhood and left his Shīʿah disputing over his existence and his vicegerency, being blinded by Taqiyyah from understanding the reality of the religion he brought and quarrelling to the extent of excommunicating each other.

As for Khid̄ar and Ilyās عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, the research scholars are of the opinion that they both had passed away.² And even if they are hypothetically assumed to have

1 Sūrah al-Hūd: 36.

2 *Al-Muntaqā* p. 26. According to Ibn Ḥazm the view of the life of Ilyās and Khid̄ar عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ is taken from Judaism because the Jews believed in the life of Ilyās, Finḥās ibn al-ʿĀzār ibn Hārūn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. Some Sufis followed them in claiming that they met Ilyās عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ in the jungles (see: *al-Faṣl* 5/37). Likewise some Sufis were of the opinion of the life of Khid̄ar عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, there are stories regarding them meeting him and benefitting from him (see: Ibn ʿArabī: *al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyyah* 1/241; Ibn ʿAṭāʾ al-Iskandarī: *Laṭāʾif al-Minan* p. 52-53; *Ṭabaqāt al-Shaʿrānī* 1/97, 2/5; see also: *al-Faṣl* 5/37-38; Ibn Ḥajr: *Tahdhīb Al-Tahdhīb* 7/477. Ibn Ḥazm has considered the claims of the Sufis of benefitting from Khid̄ar عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ to be against the belief of Khatm al-Nubuwwah (see: *al-Faṣl* 5/38).

¹remained alive, the similarity is still not valid, because they were not entrusted with providing guidance for this Ummah and leading it. As opposed to their Mahdī who is according to them responsible for all the Muslims in all their affairs.

As for Iblīs, the information regarding his prolonged life appears in the Qur’ān, but the Mahdī’s existence was denied by his families and many factions of his followers. Furthermore, Iblīs exhorts all his efforts in misleading the creation from the way of Allah (and it is undeniably clear that the adherence of the Shī’ah to a non-existent person is definitely from his efforts). As for their awaited, there is no sign of his existence, nor any information. Likewise Iblīs is not a human, so drawing a similarity with him is not free from questions in all conditions.

As for the remaining humans who enjoyed prolonged lives, despite them having reached whatever age they reached they cannot even come close to a portion of the age they claim for their Mahdī. All the examples their scholars mentioned in the fourth century do not hold any weight today due to the age of their awaited Mahdī exceeding them by a thousand years and more, and also because the aforementioned examples were of people who did not have the responsibility of the Mahdī and his tasks.

One of their contemporary scholars has endeavoured to give a logical explanation of the possibility of the existence of the Mahdī and his life for such an extended period of time in light of modern day medical language. He says:

وطول الحياة أكثر من العمر الطبيعي أو الذي يتخيل أنه العمر الطبيعي لا يمنع منها الطب ولا يحيلها، غير أن الطب بعد لم يتوصل إلي ما يمكنه من تعميره حياة الإنسان وإذا عجز عنه الطب فإن الله قادر على كل شيء

1 continued from page 1172

And the claim that Khiḏar ؑ is alive till today is against evidence and the views of the research scholars. See: *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/28; Ibn al-Qayyim: *al-Manār al-Munīf* p. 67-76. And for details regarding Khiḏar ؑ see: Ibn Kathīr: *al-Bidāyah wa Al-Nihāyah* 1/325-327; Ibn Ḥajr: *Fatẖ al-Bārī* 6/309-312; *al-Iṣābah* 2/286-335. Ibn Ḥajr has written a small booklet in investigating the matter of Khiḏar ؑ at the end of which he is strongly inclined to the opposite of what the commonality believe regarding his continuous life (see: *al-Zahr al-Naḍr fī Naba’ Khiḏar* as part of *Majmū’ah al-Rasā’il al-Minbariyyah* 2/234).

The exceedingness of life over the average age or what is considered to be the average age is not an impossibility according to medicine. However, medicine has not reached the extent whereby it can elongate the life of a human, but if medicine is incapable then Allah ﷻ is capable of doing anything.¹

And Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā' says:

أن أكابر فلاسفة الغرب قالوا بإمكان الخلود في الدنيا للإنسان

Some of the great philosophers of the west suggest that it is possible for humans to remain forever in this world.²

He further says:

قال بعض كبار علماء أوروبا: لولا سيف بن ملجم لكان علي بن أبي طالب من الخالدين. لأنه قد جمع جميع صفات الكمال والاعتدال

A great scholar of Europe said, "Had it not been for the sword of Ibn Muljim³ 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib would have lived forever, because he was an embodiment of all the qualities of perfection and balance."⁴

This is what some of the views of the disbelievers, on condition that this proven from them, suggest in this regard, however, Allah ﷻ says the following to his Nabī:

1 'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah p. 108.

2 Aṣl al-Shī'ah p. 70.

3 This is based upon the Mu'tazilī viewpoint who aver that a murderer reduces the life of the murdered person. This is a view in complete contrast with what is firmly established in Qur'ān and the Sunnah which prove that whoever dies only dies after he has completed his time (see: *Majmū' Fatāwā Ibn Taymiyah* 8/516; *Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah* p. 92; *Lawāmi' al-Anwār* 1/348).

4 Aṣl al-Shī'ah p. 70.

وَمَا جَعَلْنَا لِبَشَرٍ مِّن قَبْلِكَ الْخُلْدَ أَفَإِن مَّتَّ فَهُمْ الْخَالِدُونَ

And We did not grant to any man before you eternity [on earth]; so if you die – would they be eternal?¹

And he says:

كُلُّ نَفْسٍ ذَائِقَةُ الْمَوْتِ

Every soul shall taste death.²

Likewise he says:

نَحْنُ قَدَرْنَا بَيْنَكُمْ الْمَوْتَ وَمَا نَحْنُ بِمَسْخُوفِينَ

We have decreed death among you, and We are not to be outdone.³

He knows his creation better than anyone else and is the most truthful of all speakers. Hence after what he says, there is no room for the opinion of a disbeliever whose desire is to live forever in this world even though it be by clinging on to false hopes.

There is a very accurate statement of ‘Alī al-Riḍā, which is documented in the books of the Shī‘ah, which he said in refuting those many Shī‘ī sects who believed in the life of some members of the Ahl al-Bayt, refused to accept their death and claimed that they are in occultation and that they will return; this statement is one of the strongest refutations of the Twelvers from their own narrations. In *Rijāl al-Kashshī* it is reported that when ‘Alī al-Riḍā was told that some people have terminated the line of Imāmah upon your father and they claim that he did not die, he said:

1 Sūrah al-Ambiyā’: 34.

2 Āl ‘Imrān: 184; al-Ambiyā’: 35; al-‘Ankabūt: 57.

3 Al-Wāqī‘ah: 60.

كذبوا وهم كفار بما أنزل الله عز وجل علي محمد صلي الله عليه وسلم. ولو كان الله يمد في أجل أحد لمد الله في أجل رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم.

They have lied. And they are disbelievers in what Allah ﷻ has revealed upon Muḥammad ﷺ. If Allah were to extend the lifetime of any person he would have extended the lifetime of Rasūl Allah ﷺ.¹

But they oppose the statement of their Imām and claim that Allah ﷻ extended his life, i.e. the Mahdī, due to the people being in need of him, and due to everything in life revolving around him. For if it were not for him, the earth would sink and drown all its people.²

The Mahdī after his Alleged Return:

The Sharī'ah of their Mahdī:

Ibn Bābawayh has pointed out in his book *Al-I'tiqādāt*, which also known as the *religion of the Imāmiyyah*, that when the Mahdī will return he will abrogate the constitution of Islam regarding inheritance. He narrates from al-Ṣādiq that he said:

إن الله آخي بين الأرواح في الأظلة قبل أن يخلق لأبدان بألني عام. فلو قد قام فائنا أهل البيت أورت الأخ الذي آخي بينهما في الأظلة لم يرث الأخ من الولادة.

Allah established brotherhood between the souls in the shadows two thousand years before he created the bodies. Hence when our Mahdī will emerge he will make a brother inherit from his brother from the shadows and not from his brother from birth.³

Perhaps this narration discloses the intent of the spearheaders of this band on basing relationships on partiality and movements instead of basing them on

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 458.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/179.

3 *Al-I'tiqādāt* p. 83.

blood and kinship in inheritance, thereby usurping the wealth of people under the pretext of this so called relationship and brotherhood. It similarly divulges that which they aspire to achieve after the establishment of their promised rule, i.e. the implementation of these base ambitions and also the fact that they endeavour to give credence to them by attributing them to the Ahl al-Bayt.

This narration also exposes the position of the fabricators thereof regarding the implementation of the Sharī'ah of Islam and their desire to discard it. It thus mirrors a heretic notion of striving to discard the Sharī'ah and rebel against the belief of *Khatm al-Nubuwwah* (seal of prophethood).

Together with these claims being diametrically opposed to the Sharī'ah of Islam they are against the reasoning of logic. Simply because inheritance is based upon the outward relationship people have with each other which is based upon birth and kinship, as for the alleged brotherhood which existed from time immemorial, how do humans identify it and thus how can it be a basis for distributing inheritance.

Their awaited Mahdī will likewise alter the Sharī'ah ruling of collecting tax from the people of the book, and their narrations clearly mention that their awaited Mahdī will in doing so oppose the precedent of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. The narration states:

ولا يقبل صاحب هذا الأمر الجزية كما قبلها رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

And the man of this matter will not accept tax as Rasūl Allah ﷺ had accepted.¹

This acknowledgement is enough to show how drastically juxtaposed he will be from the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and how he will intentionally alter it. This raises the question: Was the intention of the fabricator of these narrations to

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/349.

make the Sharī'ah of Islam lose its importance in the hearts of his followers and to instigate them to revolt against it?

Rather even the rulings of the courts of the Mahdī will be issued against the Sharī'ah of Nabī ﷺ. In *al-Kāfī* and other books the following narration appears:

إذا قام قائم آل محمد حكم بحكم داود وسليمان ولا يسأل بيعة

When the ruler from the family of Muḥammad will emerge he will issue rulings in accordance with the rulings of Dāwūd and Sulaymān and he will not be asked for evidence.¹

Another version of the narration states:

إذا قام قائم آل محمد حكم بين الناس بحكم داود عليه السلام ولا يحتاج إلى بيعة

When the ruler of the family of Muḥammad will emerge he will issue rulings regarding the disputes of people in accordance with the rulings of Dāwūd عليه السلام and he will require no evidence.²

Al-Kulaynī, the reliable transmitter of their Islam, has adopted this belief and established a chapter by the title, *Chapter regarding the Imāms issuing rulings in accordance with the rulings of Dāwūd and the family of Dāwūd without being required to provide any proof*.³ The Jewish connotations that this holds is not hidden. This is even more evident from the comment of one of them on this title:

أي إنهم ينسخون الدين المحمدي ويرجعون إلى دين اليهود

i.e. They will abrogate the Dīn of Muḥammad and return to the Dīn of the Jews.⁴

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/397.

2 Al-Mufīd: *Al-Irshād* p. 413; al-Ṭabarsī: *A'lām al-Warā* p. 433.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/397.

4 Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb: commentary notes on *al-Muntaqā* p. 302.

See how the fabricators of these narrations, who have misleadingly worn the garb of Shī'ism, yearn for a state wherein rulings are issued contrary to the Sharī'ah of Islam.

Some of their narrations suggest that sometimes he will issue rulings in accordance with the rulings of Ādam, sometimes Dāwūd, and sometimes Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. They further state that some of his followers will oppose him due to not ruling in accordance with the Sharī'ah of Islam, however, he will tackle them with severity by issuing an order of their execution.¹

The narrations present some examples of his rulings and judgements:

إنه يحكم بثلاث لم يحكم بها أحد قبله: يقتل الشيخ الزاني، ويقتل مانع الزكاة، ويورث الأخ أخاه في الأظلة، وإنه يقتل من بلغ العشرين ولم يتفقه في الدين

He will issue three rulings which no one before him ever issued: He will kill a married person who commits adultery, he will kill the person who refuses to pay Zakāh, he will make his brother from the shadows inherit from his brother,² and he will kill any youngster who reaches the age of twenty and has not acquired the knowledge of Dīn.³

Likewise the rule of the awaited Mahdī will be based upon issuing rulings for every denomination in accordance with its religion, whereas according to Islam it is impermissible to rule but in accordance with the Sharī'ah of the Qur'ān. This is unanimously agreed upon by all Muslims.⁴ One of their narrations state:

إذا قام القائم قسم بالسوية وعدل في الرعية واستخرج التوراة وسائر كتب الله تعالى من غار بأنطاكية، حتي يحكم بين أهل التوراة بالتوراة وبين أهل الإنجيل بالإنجيل وبين أهل الزبور بالزبور وبين أهل القرآن بالقرآن.

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/389.

2 Ibn Bābawayh: *al-Khiṣāl* p. 169; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/359; al-Kāzīmī: *Bashārah al-Islām* p. 275.

3 Al-Ṭabarsī: *A'lām al-Warā* p. 431; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/152.

4 Ibn Taymiyah: *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/127; *al-Muntaqā* p. 343.

When the Mahdī emerges he will distribute with fairness, he will exercise justice with his subjects, he will extract the Torah and all the divine books from the cave of Antioch and issue rulings for the people of the Torah with the Torah, for the people of the Bible with the Bible, for the people of the Zabūr with the Zabūr, and for the people of the Qur’ān with the Qur’ān.¹

This institution which the fabricators of these narrations aspire to implement and whose implementation they attribute to the Mahdī is to a very large extent in harmony with the idea of a global religion which is being espoused by the freemasons. It is a heretical idea which is based upon discarding all heavenly religions under the pretence of freedom of thought and belief.

Amidst all of these devious ideas which strive to abrogate the Qur’ān, invent new rulings which Allah has not sanctioned, having recourse to the rulings of Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and not to the Sharī’ah of Muḥammad صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and implementing the constitutions of other religions other than the injunctions of the Qur’ān, we learn of a poisonous idea which can be considered the aftermath of all the aforementioned changes. The crux of this idea is the discarding of the Qur’ān and supplanting it with another book. This is what the narration of al-Nu‘mānī which he narrates from Abū Baṣīr suggests:

قال أبو جعفر رضي الله عنه: يقوم القائم بأمر جديد وقضاء جديد. لكأنني أنظر إليه بين الركن والمقام يبيع الناس علي كتاب جديد

Abū Ja’far said, “The Mahdī will emerge with a new matter, with a new book, and with a new constitution.² It is as if I can see him accepting the allegiance of the people between the black stone and Maqām (the stone which holds the imprints of the feet of Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام upon a new book.”³

Whilst some other narrations state that their Mahdī will try to avert the people from the Qur’ān claiming that it is interpolated and he will produce another

1 Al-Nu‘mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 157; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/351.

2 Al-Nu‘mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 154; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/354; *Ilzām al-Nāṣib* 2/283.

3 Al-Nu‘mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 176; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/135.

book which is opposed to it. He will try and misguide the people by claiming that his book is the complete book which Allah revealed upon Muḥammad ﷺ. The non-Arabs will be the ones making an effort to propagate it amongst the people and instruct them in it. And in doing so, they will encounter tremendous difficulty because of wanting to change the sentiments of the people regarding the Book of Allah.¹

These are the narrations which were being surreptitiously circulated regarding the rule of the Mahdī after his return during the glorious days of the Islamic empire.

A person who does not believe in the doctrine of their Mahdī might assume that it is purely based upon imagination and has no reality to it, because the Mahdī does not exist and thus his fictitious rule will never reach realisation, so discussing it might just be an exercise in futility. Whilst this is true, it is important to understand that these narrations expose the inner intentions of their fabricators and their goals against the Sharīah of Islam. They are inferiority complexes which entail grave implications which sort of smack of the aspirations of these fabricators and the type of governance they are yearning for; They are dreams which divulge the ploys of those elements which crept into the ranks of the Muslim empire under the disguise of Shī'ism with the intention of interpolating the Qur'ān. Their struggle against the Muslim empire under the pretext of 'there is no rule but for the Imāms' is intended to destroy the Muslim empire and replace it with another one which will be governed by the governance of the alleged awaited Mahdī.

The Life and Deeds of the Awaited Mahdī:

As for his way of life, it entails characteristics of his new Sharīah. He will be responsible for harassing the Muslims regarding their holy places and Masjids, i.e. he will be responsible for demolishing the two holy Ḥarams. Their narrations state:

1 This has passed already on p. 345 - 346 of this book.

إن القائم يهدم المسجد الحرام حتي يرده إلي أساسه ومسجد الرسول صلي الله عليه وآله إلي أساسه ويرد البيت إلي موضعه وإقامته علي أساسه

The Mahdī will demolish the *Masjid Ḥarām* (Masjid Aqsa) and return it to its foundation, the Masjid of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and return it to its foundation, and he will return the Ka'bah to its place and establish it on its foundations.¹

Similarly, he will advance toward the graves of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and his two Companions and will start, as their narrations suggest, with demolishing the wall around them. He will then remove them from their graves (i.e. Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا) fresh and full of life. Subsequently, he will curse them, denounce them, crucify them, take them down, burn them, and then dispose of their ashes in the wind.² Another narration mentions:

أول ما يبدأ به القائم... يخرج هذين رطبين غضين فيحرقهما ويذريهما في الريح ويكسر المسجد

The first thing the Mahdī will start with is that he will extract these two from their graves fresh and kicking. He will burn them and scatter their ashes in the air and demolish the Masjid.³

They have attributed to Allah, and Pure is He from what the transgressors attribute to Him, that He told Nabī ﷺ the following on the journey of Mi'rāj:

وهذا القائم. هو الذي يشفي قلوب شيعتك من الظالمين والجاحدين والكافرين، فيخرج اللات والعزي يعنون خليفة رسول الله صلي عليه وسلم) طرين فيحرقهما

This Mahdī will cool the hearts of your partisans from the two oppressors, deniers, and disbelievers; he will remove Lāt and ‘Uzzā from their graves (i.e. the two successors of Rasūl Allah ﷺ) fresh and he will burn them.⁴

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 282; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/338.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/386.

3 Ibid.

4 Ibn Bābawayh: *‘Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā* 1/58; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/379.

Their narrations also state that this will cause upheaval amongst the Muslims:

ثم يحدث حدثا فإذا فعل ذلك قالت قريش: أخرجوا بنا إلي هذا الطاغية، فوالله لو كان محمديا ما فعل،
ولو كان علويا ما فعل ولو كان فاطميا ما فعل

Then he will do something unprecedented and the Quraysh will say, “Let us go out to combat this tyrant. By Allah if he was a Muḥammadī he would not have done so, and if he was an ‘Alawī he would not have done so, and if he was a Fāṭimī he would not have done so.”¹

Commenting on this narration, their scholar and pride² al-Majlisī says:

لعل المراد بإحداث الحدث إحراق الشيخين المعونين، فلذا يسمونه عليه السلام الطاغية

Perhaps what is meant by doing something unprecedented is his burning of the two accursed Shaykhs, due to which they will call him the tyrant.³

It is unambiguously clear that these promises regarding the doings of the Mahdī which are replete in their narrations smack of the intent of their hearts on relegating the Dīn of Islam and plotting against it, so much so that they yearn for an opportunity wherein they can demolish the two holy sites of the Muslims, and exhume the graves of the two pure men. But when they find themselves unable to carry out these ploys due to the might of the Islamic empire at that time, they pacify themselves, console themselves, and cool the grudges in their hearts against those who conquered their lands, destroyed their monarchies and propagated Islam among them with these dreams and hopes. These narrations, thus, in essence expose what they desire to accomplish if they are given an opportunity to rule and dominate.

It is in this connection that their contemporaries desire to conquer Makkah and Madīnah, as has been heard from their scholars, i.e. in order to accomplish their

1 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/58; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/342.

2 One of the titles accorded to him is ‘The pride of the Ummah,’ as you will find on the cover of his books.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/346.

dreams which are recorded in their narrations, as will appear.¹ They plan and Allah plans, and Allah is the best of planners.

Their Mahdī will not suffice upon this, rather he will go about killing the Arabs and annihilating them from their roots. Their narrations portray the Arabs as victims who will suffer at the hands of their Absent Imām; when he returns he will not leave any man, woman, child or adult, rather he will inflict all of them without exception. Al-Nu‘mānī narrates:

عن الحارث بن المغيرة وذريح المحاربي: قال أبو عبد الله عليه السلام: ما بقي بيننا وبين العرب إلا الذبح

Ḥārith ibn al-Mughīrah and Dharīḥ al-Muḥāribī say that Abū ‘Abd Allāh said, “Nothing besides slaughter remains between us and the Arabs.”²

This narration seemingly does not differentiate between those who are Shī‘ah and those who are not, but their narrations emphasise that no one from the Arabs will be a partisan of their Mahdī. They state:

اتق العرب فإن لهم خبر سوء إما إنه لم يخرج مع القائم منهم أحد

Fear the Arabs for there is bad news for them. Behold none of them will join the Mahdī.³

But there are a lot of Shī‘ah amongst the Arabs. Their narrations, however, mention that they will be cleansed till only a very few will remain.⁴

They specifically mention the various types of murder tactics which will be carried out against the tribe of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, the Quraysh, wherefrom were

1 In the chapter regarding contemporary Shī‘ah and their connection with their predecessors.

2 Al-Nu‘mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 155; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/349.

3 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 284; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/114.

4 Al-Nu‘mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 137; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/114.

his elite Companions. In *Al-Irshād* of al-Mufīd the following narration appears:

عن عبد الله بن المغيرة عن أبي عبد الله عليه السلام قال: إذا قام القائم من آل محمد عليه السلام إقام خمسمائة من قريش فضرب أعناقهم ثم أقام خمسمائة فضرب أعناقهم ثم خمسمائة أخرى حتي يفعل ذلك ست مرات. قلت: ويبلغ عدد هؤلاء هذا؟ قال: نعم منهم ومن مواليهم

‘Abd Allah ibn Mughīrah narrates from Abū ‘Abd Allah عليه السلام that he said, “When the ruler from the family of Muḥammad will rise he will make five hundred members of the Quraysh stand and he will decapitate them. He will then again make five hundred stand and he will decapitate them and then another five hundred. He will do this six times.”

I asked, “Will their numbers reach that amount?”

He said, “Yes, including them and their allies.”¹

It is clear that specifically targeting the Arabs and killing them posits the nationalistic inclinations of the inventors of these narrations. It also tells us of the deep seated enmity the godfathers of Shī‘ism had for the Arabs and the desire to mitigate their anguish by killing, in actual fact, is not due to their ethnicity but due to the religion that they adhere to.

Furthermore, their narrations do not forget to inflict the pure family of Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم with a catastrophe from the catastrophes of their Mahdī: they claim that the Mother of the Believers, ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها, the truthful daughter of a truthful father and the beloved of Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم, will be raised from her grave before the Day of Judgment.² This is because, as they lie, she committed a crime inducing a capital punishment in the time of Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم, but Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم did not execute the punishment upon her, as they claim. Whereas he is the one who is reported to have said:

وأيم الله لو أن فاطمة بنت محمد سرقت لقطعت يدها

1 *Al-Irshād* p. 411; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/338.

2 This is based on their doctrine of Raj‘ah which will discuss after this discussion if Allah wills.

By Allah! If Fāṭimah the daughter of Muḥammad were to steal I would cut her hand.¹

They claim that his mercy for her had stopped him from executing the punishment upon her, whereas Allah ﷻ says:

وَلَا تَأْخُذْكُمْ بِهِمَا رَأْفَةٌ فِي دِينِ اللَّهِ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ

And do not be taken by pity for them in the religion [i.e., law] of Allah.²

Therefore he did not execute the punishment upon her, but ironically their Mahdī will execute what the Best of Creation was unable execute; and this will be in the era of *Raj'ah* (return), as they allege.³

1 A portion of a Ḥadīth which features in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: Chapter of the Ambiyā': 4/151, Chapter regarding the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah: sub-chapter regarding the mention of Uṣamah ibn Zayd: 4/214, Chapter of capital punishments: sub-chapter regarding amputating the hand of a thief: 2/1315; *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*: chapter of capital punishments: sub-chapter regarding intercession in a capital punishment: 4/537; *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*: chapter of capital punishments: subchapter regarding the undesirability of intercession in capital punishments: 4/37-38; *Sunan al-Nasā'ī*: chapter regarding amputating the hand of a thief: sub-chapter regarding the mention of the Makhzūmiyyah who stole: 8/72; *Sunan Ibn Mājah*: chapter of capital punishments: sub-chapter regarding intercession in capital punishments: 2/851; *Sunan al-Dārimī*: chapter of capital punishments: sub-chapter regarding capital punishments in front of the ruler: 1/569, etc.

2 Sūrah al-Nūr: 2.

3 The narration which is allegedly attributed to Abū Ja'far states:

إِذَا لَوْ قَامَ قَائِمُنَا لَقَدْ رَدْتُ إِلَيْهِ الْحَمِيرَاءَ حَتَّى يَجْلِدَهَا الْحَدَّ وَحَتَّى يَنْتَقِمَ لَابْنَةِ مُحَمَّدٍ فَاطِمَةَ عَلَيْهَا السَّلَامُ. قُلْتُ: جَعَلْتَ فِدَاكَ وَلَمْ يَجْلِدْهَا الْحَدَّ؟ قَالَ: لَفَرَيْتُهَا عَلَيَّ أُمُّ إِبْرَاهِيمَ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ. قُلْتُ: فَكَيْفَ آخِرُهُ اللَّهُ لِلْقَائِمِ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. فَقَالَ لَهُ: إِنْ اللَّهُ تَبَارَكَ وَتَعَالَى بَعَثَ مُحَمَّدًا صَلَّى اللَّهُ وَآلَهُ رَحْمَةً وَبَعَثَ الْقَائِمَ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ نَقْمَةً.

“Behold, when our Mahdī will emerge, *Ḥūmayrā'* (a title of 'Ā'ishah) will be brought to him so that he may execute the punishment upon her and so that he may take revenge for Fāṭimah ﷺ the daughter of the Nabī ﷺ from her.”

I asked, “May I be sacrificed for you, why will she be punished?”

He said, “Because of her allegation against the mother of Ibrāhīm.”

I asked, “So why did Allah delay it till the emergence of the Mahdī?”

He said, “Allah ﷻ sent Muḥammad ﷺ as a mercy and he will send the Mahdī as a punishment.” (See: *Ilal al-Sharā'i* p. 579-580; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/314-315).

This suggests that their Mahdī is more competent than Nabī ﷺ, the Seal of All Prophets, and is more capable of implementing the Dīn of Allah than the one who was sent as an exemplar for the world.

This is explicitly mentioned in some of their narrations, for Ibn Bābawayh narrates the following from Abū Baṣīr:

قال أبو عبد الله عليه السلام في قوله عز وجل: هُوَ الَّذِي أَرْسَلَ رَسُولَهُ بِالْهُدَى وَدِينِ الْحَقِّ لِيُظْهِرَهُ عَلَى الدِّينِ كُلِّهِ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْمُشْرِكُونَ والله ما نزل تأويلهما بعد ولا ينزل تأويلهما حتي يخرج القائم عليه السلام

Abū ‘Abd Allah عليه السلام said regarding the verse, It is He who has sent His Messenger with guidance and the religion of truth to manifest it over all religion, although they who associate others with Allah dislike it,¹ “By Allah its interpretation has not come down as yet, nor will it come down but after the emergence of the Mahdī...”²

In other words, the Mahdī will accomplish that which the Ambiyā’ عليه السلام were unable to accomplish. This is also clear from the statements of some of their scholars in contemporary times³ which were denounced by the Muslim world, as will come.⁴ This is so because they claim that the knowledge that their Mahdī will be tenfold more than that of the Ambiyā’ عليه السلام. The following appears in *Biḥār al-Anwār* and other books:

continued from page 1186

Commenting on this narration one of their contemporary scholars provides a text which makes mention of the allegation:

إن إبراهيم ليس منك وإنه ابن فلان القبطي

Ibrāhīm is not from you, he is the son of so and so Coptic.

The narration states that Nabī ﷺ entrusted ‘Alī with executing her but ‘Alī revealed her innocence. (See: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/315: the footnotes).

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 33.

2 *Ikmal al-Dīn* p. 628; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52: 324.

3 Khomeini for example.

4 In the chapter: ‘the contemporary Shī‘ah and their link with their predecessors.

عن أبان عن أبي عبد الله قال: العلم سبعة وعشرون حرفاً فجميع ما جاءت به الرسل حرفان. فلم يعرف الناس حتى اليوم غير الحرفين، فإذا قام قائمنا أخرج الخمسة العشرين حرفاً فبثها في الناس، ضم إليها الحرفان حتى يبثها سبعة وعشرون حرفاً

Abān narrates from Abū ‘Abd Allah that he said, “Knowledge has twenty seven dimensions; all the knowledge of the Ambiyā’ equates to two dimensions, as result, people only knew two dimensions of knowledge to date. When our Mahdī will emerge he will reveal the other twenty five dimensions of knowledge and spread them amongst the people. He will include the two dimensions to them and propagate them as twenty seven dimensions.”¹

Moving on, the formidable operation of slaughtering which the Twelver Shī’ah dream of will include all denominations and ethnicities with the exception of their sect. This is because their Mahdī will emerge as:

موتور غضبان أسفا... يجرّد السيّف علي عاتقه

A revengeful, angry, and depressed person... who will place the sword on his shoulder.²

He will start killing and exterminating the Ahl al-Sunnah whom the Shī’ah at times dub ‘*the Murji’ah*’ (postponers)³ regarding whom the Imām said:

ويح هذه المرجئة إلي من يلجأون غدا إذا قام قائمنا

Woe be to the Murji’ah. By who will they seek shelter tomorrow when our Mahdī will emerge?⁴

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/336: Taken from *al-Kharā’ij* of al-Rāwandī, as is indicated by al-Majlisī (ibid).

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/361.

3 Their scholar al-Ṭarīḥī says, “They have been dubbed ‘the Murji’ah’ because they claim that Allah ﷻ suspended the appointment of an Imām so that his appointment takes place by way of the election of the Ummah of Muḥammad ﷺ.” See: *Majma’ al-Baḥrayn* 1/177-178; see also: *Mir’āt al-Uqūl* 4/371.

4 Al-Nu’mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 190; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/357.

He will only exclude the one who repents, i.e. the one who accepts their creed, hence he says:

من تاب تاب الله عليه، ومن أسر نفاقاً فلا يبعد الله غيره، ومن أظهر شيئاً أحرق الله دمه.

The one who repents he will accept his repentance. The one who hides his hypocrisy Allah will not distance anyone besides him. And the one who reveals some of it Allah will burn his blood.

He then said:

ثم يذبحهم والذي نفسي بيده كما يذبح القصاب شاته - وأوماً بيده إلى حلقه

He will slaughter them, by the one in whose hand is my life, like a butcher slaughters his sheep. He said this indicating with his hand to his neck.¹

And at times they call them *Nawāṣib* and they say:

إذا قام قائمنا عرضوا كل ناصب عليه. فإن أقر بالإسلام وهي الولاية وإلا ضربت عنقه أو أقر بالجزية فأداها كما يؤدي أهل الذمة

When the Mahdī will emerge, they will present every *Nāṣibī* to him. If he concedes Islam, which is the Imāmah of the Imāms, well and good, or else his head will be decapitated. Or he can commit to paying taxes like the non-Muslim citizens.²

However, some of their narrations aver that taxes will be accepted from them as they will be accepted from the People of the Book. For their Imām was asked regarding the situation of the non-Muslim citizens under the rule of the Mahdī and he said:

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/357; *al-Nu'mānī: al-Ghaybah* p. 190-191.

2 *Tafsīr Furāt* p. 100; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52: 373. The aspect of accepting taxes from them is against those narrations which state that they will not be accepted from them, as has passed already under the discussion of his Sharī'ah.

يسالهمهم كما سالهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ويؤدون الجزية عن يد وهم صاغرون

He will grant them amnesty just as Rasūl Allah ﷺ had granted them amnesty. And they will pay taxes with humiliation.¹

As for the others who oppose the Shī'ah, the Imām says the following regarding them:

ما لمن خالفنا في دولتنا نصيب. إن الله قد أحل لنا دماءهم عند قيام قائمنا

There is no share for those who oppose us under our rule. Allah ﷻ has made their blood permissible for us after the emergence of our Mahdī.²

To the extent that their Imām will hunt the Zaydiyyah, a non-extremist Shī'ī sect, and kill them. Their narrations state:

إذا قام القائم عليه السلام سار إلي الكوفة فيخرج منها بضعة عشر ألف أنفس يدعون البترية عليهم السلاح. فيقولون له: ارجع من حيث جئت فلا حاجة لنا في بني فاطمة فيضع فيهم السيف حتي يأتي علي آخرهم

When the Imām will emerge, he will go to Kufah and banish therefrom ten thousand and some odd people who will be known as the Batriyyah³ and will be armed. They will say to him, “Return from where you came, for we have no need for the Banū Fāṭimah.” He will thus unsheathe the sword upon them till he will kill all of them.⁴

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/ 376.

2 Ibid.

3 Al-Batriyyah: the followers of al-Ḥasan ibn Ṣālīḥ ibn Ḥayy and the followers of Kathīr al-Nawā who was known as Abtar. They are also known as the Ṣālīḥiyyah. Part of their beliefs is, as al-Ash'arī states, that they deny the return of the dead before the coming of the Day of Judgement and they do not believe in the rule of 'Alī ﷺ but after his election. They are the subject of the Zaydiyyah. (See: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/144; *al-Mīlāl wa al-Niḥāl* 1/161; *al-Khuṭaṭ* 2/352).

4 *Al-Irshād* p. 411-412; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/338.

Instead their narrations mentions that he will kill innocent people:

إذا خرج القائم قتل ذراري قتلة الحسين بفعل آبائها

When the Mahdī emerges he will kill the children of the murderers of
Ḥusayn for what their forefathers did.¹

In light of these narrations their Mahdī will have no other task but to kill people.
He will not leave anyone alive² and he will not accept the repentance of anyone.³

Some of their narrations portray the extent to which bloodshed will reach at the
hands of the Mahdī, they state:

لو يعلم الناس ما يصنع القائم إذا خرج لأحب أكثرهم ألا يروه مما يقتل من الناس... حتي يقول كثير من
الناس: ليس هذا من آل محمد. لو كان من آل محمد لرحم

If people come to know of what the Mahdī will do after his appearance
most of them would prefer not to see him due to the amount of people he
will kill... To the extent that many people will say, “This person is not from
the family of Muḥammad. Had he been from the family of Muḥammad he
would have had mercy.”⁴

This takes the Mahdī out of the characteristic of mercy and justice for which
the Ahl al-Bayt were known, rather with this behaviour he has parted from the
Sunnah of Nabī ﷺ. In fact they actually boldly claim this:

سئل الباقر: أيسير القائم بسيرة محمد؟ فقال: هيهات! إن رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم سار في أمته
باللين وكان يتألف الناس، والقائم أمر أن يسير بالقتل وألا يستتيب أحدا، فويل لمن ناوأه

1 'Ilal al-Sharā'i' p. 411-412; 'Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā 1/273; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/313.

2 Biḥār al-Anwār 52/231.

3 Biḥār al-Anwār 52/249. One version of the narration mentions that he will not appoint anyone as his
deputy i.e. he will do all the killing himself (see: Ibid).

4 Al-Nu'mānī: al-Ghaybah p. 154; Biḥār al-Anwār 52/354.

Al-Bāqir was asked, “Will the Mahdī tread the way of Muḥammad?”

He said, “Far-fetched indeed! Rasūl Allah ﷺ treaded the path of mercy with his Ummah and he united the hearts of the people, as for the Mahdī, he will tread the path of murder, he will not accept the repentance of anyone. So woe be to one who disassociates from him.”¹

So the Shī'ah claim that he will be instructed with a way other than the way of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. Whereas the unanimity of the Muslims asserts that whatever goes against the way of Rasūl Allah ﷺ is not part of Islam. So will he be sent with another message other than Islam?

And how is it possible that he will be ordered to oppose the way of Rasūl Allah ﷺ? Will he be a Nabī who will receive revelation afresh, whereas it is an accepted fact that there is no Nabī after the Seal of the Prophets and there is no revelation after his demise? And any person who claims the contrary is a liar and a fraudster due to him opposing the epistemologically certain texts and the unanimity of the Ummah regarding the termination of revelation and Nubuwwah with the demise of Rasūl Allah ﷺ.

These narrations, nonetheless, portray what is in the hearts of their fabricators, viz. hatred for people, especially the Muslim Ummah, which opposes them in their ways, their yearning for a day to come wherein they can make their dreams a reality, the reality which is divulged in these narrations, and which is represented in the Shī'ī world of the Safawid era, the country of the scholars and in their movements in Lebanon, as will come.²

It is an undisputed fact that Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī رضي الله عنه, whom they claim to be partisans of, did not excommunicate his opponents and did not combat but those who rebelled against him. It follows that their Mahdī who will do all these horrendous acts and those who follow him in doing so, are not from the partisans

1 Al-Nu'mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 153; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/353

2 In the chapter regarding the influence of the Shī'ah on the Islāmic world.

of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. More so when they have acknowledged in their narrations that their Mahdī will not tread the way of ‘Alī; it is narrated that al-Ṣādiq was asked:

أيسير القائم بخلاف سيرة علي؟ فقال نعم. وذلك أن عليا سار باليمن والكف لعلمه أن شيعة سيظهر عليهم من بعده، وأما القائم فيسير بالسيف والسي، لأنه يعلم أن شيعة لن يظهر عليهم من بعده أبدا

“Will the Mahdī tread a path other than that of ‘Alī?”

He said, “Yes. And that is because ‘Alī treaded the path of forgiving and withholding due to having knowledge that his partisans will be defeated in the future. As for the Mahdī, he will tread the path of the sword and imprisonment due to knowing that his Shī‘ah will never be defeated after him.”¹

Whilst addressing some of the Shī‘ah Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq said:

كيف أنت إذا رأيت أصحاب القائم قد ضربوا فساطيطهم في مسجد الكوفة، ثم أخرج المثال الجديد علي العرب شديد. قال قلت: جعلت فداك ما هو؟ قال: الذبح. قال: قلت بأي شيء يسير فيهم بما سار فيهم علي بن أبي طالب في أهل السواد؟ قال لا. إن عليا سار بما في الجفر الأبيض، وهو الكف، وهو يعلم أنه سيظهر علي شيعة من بعده. وإن القائم يسير بما في الجفر الأحمر وهو الذبح، وهو يعلم أنه لا يظهر علي شيعة

“What will be your condition when you see the companions of the Mahdī erecting their tents in the masjid of Kufah? The Mahdī will then extract the new example which will be severe upon the Arabs.”

The narrator says that he asked, “May I be sacrificed for you, what will that be?”

Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq said, “Slaughter.”

He asked, “How will he deal with them? Like how ‘Alī dealt with the people of Iraq?”

Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq said, “No! ‘Alī implemented what is in the white goat skin, i.e. withholding, knowing that his partisans will be defeated after him.

1 Al-Nu‘mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 153; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/353.

And the Mahdī will implement that which is the red skin, i.e. slaughter, knowing that his Shī'ah will never be defeated after him.”¹

In this way, the alleged Mahdī will emerge with a new matter, a new book, a new way and a new constitution.²

This is enough in explaining that what the Shī'ah dream of has no basis in the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of his Nabī ﷺ. Rather it is a new innovation which their Mahdī will emerge with.

And when people will be living in bloodshed, severed bodies, and fear from the Mahdī of the Shī'ah whose emergence will be a punishment upon them—just as the prophethood of Nabī ﷺ was a mercy³—the army of the Mahdī and his companions will be living a completely different life which will be filled with all types of bounties and delights. He will tell them not to carry any food, drink, or fodder on their campaigns whereupon his companions will say:

إنه يريد أن يقتلنا ويقتل دوابنا من الجوع والعطش، فيسير ويسرون معه. فأول منزل ينزله يضرب الحجر فينبع منه طعام وشراب علف فيأكلون ويشربون ودوابهم حتي ينزلوا النجف من ظهر الكوفة

“He intends to kill us and kill our animals out of starvation and thirst.”⁴

But he will advance and they will as well alongside him, and in the first place where he will halt he will strike the rock and food, water, and fodder will gush forth therefrom. They will thus eat, drink, and their animals will be satiated. They will then halt in Najf which is behind Kūfah.⁵

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/318: the narration appears in *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt*, as indicated by al-Majlisī (ibid).

2 Ibid. 52/231.

3 Al-Kulaynī has narrated in *al-Kāfī* that Allah ﷻ sent Muḥammad ﷺ as a mercy and he will send the Mahdī as a calamity. (See: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/376: he attributes the narration to the chapter of *Rawḍah* in *al-Kāfī* p. 233).

4 This shows that they will be in doubt regarding the decisions of the Mahdī, so how can they be from his people?

5 Al-Nu'mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 158.

In this manner:

لا ينزل منزلا إلا انبعث منه عيون، فمن كان جائعا شبع ومن كان ظمآن روي

He will not halt at any place but that springs will gush forth. Hence whoever will be hungry will be satiated and whoever will be thirsty will be quenched.¹

And wherever he will stand the wealth of the world will accumulate by him from within the land and from without. He will thus give his companions so much wealth from there that no one before had given. Sustenance will increase in his rule due to which he will give two salaries a month and two bonuses a year.² So much so that a Shī'ī will not find anyone to give his Dinars and Dirhams to.³

These narrations to the contrary, portray the desires and ambitions which overwhelm the hearts of the Shī'ah in anticipation for tomorrow. They also portray the materialistic inclinations that they share with the Jews, i.e. the proliferation of the communist system in the world which was invented by Carl Marks.

As for the details regarding the army of the Mahdī and his people who will be with him in his slaughtering campaign, and who will enjoy his bounties and abide in his paradise, I shall present the details thereof ahead.

The Army of the Mahdī

Some of their narrations suggest that the army of the Mahdī will primarily consist of slaves and non-Arabs and that their total will be twelve thousand. The Mahdī will provide them with weaponry from his side which will be a sword and a double sided shield. He will then say to them:

1 Ibid.

2 Al-Nu'mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 158.

3 Ibid.

من لم يكن عليه مثل ما عليكم فاقتلوه

Whoever is not upon the belief you are, kill him.¹

And the narration of al-Nu'mānī states that the amount of followers the Mahdī will have is three hundred and thirteen all of who will be from the children of non-Arabs.²

Whilst on the other hand, the narrations of *Biḥār al-Anwār* states:

إذا قام قائم آل محمد استخرج من ظهر الكعبة سبعة وعشرين رجلا، خمسة وعشرين من قوم موسي الذين يقضون بالحق وبه يعدلون، وسبعة من أصحاب الكهف، ويوشع رضي موسي، ومؤمن آل فرعون، وسلمان الفارسي، وأبا دجاجة الأنصاري ومالك الأشر

When the Mahdī of the family of Muḥammad will emerge, he will extract from the Ka'bah twenty seven men: twenty five men will be from the nation of Mūsā عليه السلام who pass their decisions based on the truth and with which they establish justice, seven will be from the sleepers of the cave, Yūsha' ibn Mūsā, the believer of the family of the Pharaoh, Salmān al-Fārisī, Abū Dujānah al-Anṣārī, and Mālik al-Ashtar.³

In this narration the strong element of Judaism which was part of those who fabricated these narrations is completely clear.

Likewise, it is clear that Shī'ism is an umbrella for various types of elements, each one doing what his desires dictate to him and what his tribalism dictates to him.

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* p. 214.

2 Al-Nu'mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 214.

3 This is how the narration appears in *Biḥār al-Anwār*: 52/346. The committee of revising the book did not comment on this narration despite al-Majlisī stating that the total amount of soldiers will be twenty seven and when he went on to give details of these soldiers they amounted to thirty seven! And in *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī* 1/32 it is mentioned: "Fifteen men from the people of Mūsā عليه السلام," this narration is in harmony with the total amount 'twenty seven'. As for *Tafsīr al-Burhān* 2/41, the author has added 'and', he says, "Twenty seven men and twenty five men from the nation of Mūsā..." The 'and' obviously is an addition to make the narration more sensible.

Hence the non-Arabs fabricate narrations in their favour and so do the Jews. In this way the collections of the Shī'ah have included everyone without sifting.

In some of their narrations the details of the names of each soldier is mentioned one by one. Together with that there is mention of the place, the tribe, and the occupation of each one of them. For example:

ومن أهل الشام رجلين يقال لهما إبراهيم بن الصباح يوسف بن جريا (صريا). فيوسف عطار من أهل دمشق وأبراهيم قصاب من قرية صويقان

From the people of Syria there will two men who will be known as Ibrāhīm ibn al-Ṣabbāḥ and Yūsuf ibn Jarya (Ṣarya).¹ Yūsuf, the perfume merchant, will be from Damascus and Ibrāhīm, the butcher, will be from the Ṣuwayqān village.

He goes on to mention their names till he makes mention of three hundred and thirteen men, which is the amount of the veterans of Badr.²

When reading these names you cannot help but laugh when you notice the clear falsity of this narration and the foolish endeavour to conceal it. One cannot stop musing at the boldness to lie and the disregard for intellect. What is even more appalling is that the Shī'ah of our times are not ashamed of producing such an indictment for public consumption, revising it, and publishing it! Or maybe it is just that Allah سبحانه وتعالى intends to expose them and disclose their falsehood.

The Shī'ah and the Occultation of their Mahdī:

During the period of the occultation which the Shī'ah subscribe to and in accordance with which they lived for more than a thousand and a hundred years, the scholars of the Shī'ah stopped many injunctions of the Dīn, due to their

1 This is how the narration appears in the source. Seemingly the reviser penned both names as they appeared in two variant manuscripts.

2 Al-Bahrānī; *al-Hujjah* p. 46, the author has given reference to *Dalā'il al-Nubuwwah* p. 314.

‘representation’ of the Mahdī. Likewise they invented many beliefs and rulings which are not sanctioned by Allah ﷻ.

For example: the Shī‘ah have due to the occultation of the Mahdī stopped the Jumu‘ah Ṣalāh just as they have prohibited the appointment of a ruler for the Muslims, they said:

الجمعة والحكومة لإمام المسلمين

The Jumu‘ah and leadership is only for the Imām of the Muslims.¹

And the Imām is the awaited Mahdī.

That is why majority of the Shī‘ah do not perform Jumu‘ah till today,² to the extent that some of the later scholars have said:

إن الشيعة من زمان الإثمة كانوا تاركين للجمعة

The Shī‘ah were deserters of the Jumu‘ah prayer from the time of the Imāms.³

Similarly, the Shī‘ah do not believe in allegiance but to the Awaited Mahdī, they, therefore, renew their allegiance on a daily basis. Hence in a prayer of theirs which is known as the ‘prayer of allegiance’ they say the following:

1 *Miftāḥ al-Karāmah*: chapter of Ṣalāh: 2/69.

2 Kāzīm al-Kifā’ī, one of their contemporary scholars from Iraq, says, “All the Shī‘ah besides al-Shaykh al-Khālīṣī who performs Jumu‘ah in the Ṣafawid Maṣjid, in the Kāzīmī courtyard do not perform the Jumu‘ah Ṣalāh.” (He wrote this in a letter to Doctor ‘Alī al-Sālūs which the latter published in his book *Fiqh al-Shī‘ah* p. 263). And in Kuwait none besides Ibrāhīm Jamāl al-Dīn, the scholar of the Akhbārīs, performs Jumu‘ah (see: al-Sālūs: *Fiqh al-Shī‘ah* p. 203). When one of the Shī‘ah asked one of their senior scholars who goes by the name Muḥsin al-Ḥakīm regarding the evidence for the presence of the Mahdī to be condition for Jumu‘ah, he told him that he should not ask such questions. Likewise some of their scholars assert that Jumu‘ah is obligatory but they do not perform it (see: Muḥammad ‘Abd al-Riḍā al-Asadī: *Naṣṣ al-Kitāb wa Mutawātir al-Akhbār ‘alā Wujūb al-Jumu‘ah fī Kul al-Ā‘ṣār* p. 24/27-28).

3 Al-Bahbānī in his footnotes upon *al-Madārik*. The very same has been quoted by their scholar al-Khālīṣī in his book *al-Jumu‘ah* p. 131

اللهم إني أجدد له في صبيحة يومي هذا وما عشت من أيامي عهداً أو بيعه له في عنتي لا أحول عنها ولا أزول أبداً

O Allah I renew in the morning of this day of mine and the evenings of my days an allegiance and a pact for him which is my responsibility. I will never turn away from it or give it up.¹

Al-Majlisī says that he should then put his right hand into his left hand as in a handshake when pledging allegiance.²

Furthermore, the Imām whose obedience is obligatory upon the Muslims from 260 A.H till today is their awaited Mahdī who is hiding in the basement. Before the year 260 A.H the obedience of the remaining twelve Imāms was obligatory. As a result, the Jihād which was fought in the times of Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, and the remaining Muslim rulers was illegitimate and Ḥarām just as carrion and blood are Ḥarām. It is narrated in *al-Kāfī* and other books that Abū ‘Abd Allāh said:

القتال مع غير الإمام المفترض طاعته حرام مثل الميتة والدم والخنزير

Fighting with an Imām whose obedience is not obligatory is impermissible just as carrion, blood, and pork are impermissible.³

The armies of the Muslims who safeguard the borders, strive in the path of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى not wanting authority and without causing corruption upon earth, and those who conquered the lands of Persia are not but murderers according to the Shī‘ah. There is destruction awaiting them due to them wanting to hasten to their abode. Al-Ṭūsī narrates the following in *Al-Tahdhīb*:

عن عبد الله بن سنان قال: قلت لأبي عبد الله عليه السلام: جعلت فداك ما تقول في هؤلاء الذين يقتلون في هذه الثغور؟ قال: فقال: الويل يتعجلون قتلة في الدنيا وقتلة في الآخرة والله ما الشهيد إلا شيعتنا ولو ماتوا علي فرشهم

1 ‘Abbās al-Qummī: *Miftāḥ al-jinān* p. 538.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 102/111; *Miftāḥ al-jinān* p. 538-539.

3 *Furū‘ al-Kāfī* 1/334; *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* 2/45; *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 11/32.

‘Abd Allah ibn Sinān narrates:

I asked Abū ‘Abd Allāh, “What do you say regarding those who patrol the borders and get killed doing so?”

He said, “They are seeking destruction in advance; they are murderers in this world and murderers in the hereafter. By Allah only our Shī‘ah attain martyrdom, even if they die on their beds.”¹

As you can see, according to the Shī‘ah the Jihād of the Muslims across history is illegitimate, there is no reward therein nor any compensation, to the extent that they describe the Muslim soldiers as murderers and they strip them of the names: *Mujāhid* and *Shahīd* with which Allah ﷻ privileged them.

Can any person who is sane and free from being subject to his fanaticism and base desires ever doubt that the fabricators of these narrations are enemies seeking revenge and a group of jealous heretics; a people who are waiting for calamities to overtake the Ummah and who want it to meet ruin, who do not want Jihad for the cause of Allah ﷻ to remain in order to protect his Dīn and his lands. The conspiracy reaches an extent where they attribute these fabrications to Ja‘far al-Šādiq and other members of the Ahl al-Bayt so that they may advocate these lies amongst their people on the one hand and so that they may harm the Ahl al-Bayt on the other by tarnishing their reputation.

The Shī‘ah have likewise prohibited the establishment of the capital punishments of Allah ﷻ in a Muslim state due to the absence of their Imām, because, as they allege, the execution of the capital punishments is the duty of the emphatically appointed Imām. According to them Allah ﷻ has only emphatically appointed the Twelve Imāms, the last among who went into occultation during the mid-third century and anticipation for who is compulsory in order to establish the capital punishments. However, after approximately seventy years from his occultation

¹ *Al-Tahdhīb* 2/42; *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 11/21.

he gave permission to the Shī'ah scholars *only*—and not any judge from the judges of the Muslims—to execute the capital punishments on his behalf. Hence if none of their scholars are found in any given place, it is not permissible to execute the capital punishments due to that solely being the prerogative of the hidden Imām and his representatives from the scholars of the Shī'ah. Their scholar Ibn Bābawayh narrates the following:

عن حفص بن غياث قال: سألت أبا عبد الله عليه السلام من يقيم الحدود؟ السلطان؟ أو القاضي؟ فقال:
إقامة الحدود من إليه الحكم

Ḥafṣ ibn Ghayāth says, “I asked Abū ‘Abd Allāh, “Who will execute the capital punishments, the ruler or the judge?”

He said, “Executing the capital punishments is the prerogative of the one who has the right to rule.”¹

And al-Mufīd mentions:

فأما إقامة الحدود فهو إلي سلطان الإسلام المنصوب من قبل الله، وهم أئمة الهدى من آل محمد عليهم السلام، ومن نصبوه لذلك من الأمراء والحكام، وقد فوضوا النظر فيه إلي فقهاء شيعتهم مع الإمكان

As for the execution of the capital punishments, it is the prerogative of the Imām who is appointed by Allah ﷻ, and they are the Imāms of guidance from the family of Muḥammad ﷺ. And secondly, those whom they have nominated for their representation in that regard from the rulers and judges, i.e. the scholars of the Shī'ah whom they have accorded this authority.²

Similarly, the narrations of the Shī'ah warn against going to the courts of the Muslims and their judges:

1 Ibn Bābawayh: *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh* 4/51; *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* 10/155; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 18/338.

2 Al-Muqni'ah p, 130; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 18/338.

من تحاكم إليهم في حق أو باطل فإنما تحاكم إلي الطاغوت، وما يحكم له فإنما يأخذ سحتنا، وإن كان حقه ثابتا، لأنه أخذه بحكم الطاغوت

Whoever raises his case to them in a matter of truth or falsehood has indeed raised his case to the idols. And whatever he receives because of their decision in his favour is Ḥarām even though it be his legitimate right due to him taking it with the decision of the idols.¹

These are but few examples of the injunctions of the Sharī'ah of Islam which the Shī'ah have forbidden and postponed till the emergence of their Imām due to his absence.

They have on the other hand contrived many injunctions for themselves during the period of his occultation, such injunctions which are not sanctioned by Allah ﷻ. One among them is Taqiyyah which in Islam is a concession which is temporary and should only be practiced at the time of need. They made it a compulsory action which has to continually be practiced during the era of the occultation, it is not permissible to leave it till the emergence of the Mahdī who is never going to return due to him never being born, as emphasised by the historians the genealogists and many sects of the Shī'ah themselves, returns. Whoever does not practice upon Taqiyyah is like a person who abandons ṣalāh.²

Another one is that they have given a person the status of martyrdom when he dies solely because of embracing Shī'ism and awaiting the Mahdī, not because of striving in the path of Allah. Hence a Shī'ī is a martyr even if he dies upon his bed. Their Imām is reported to have said:

إذا مات منكم ميت قبل أن يخرج قائمنا كان شهيدا، ومن أدرك قائمنا فقتل معه، وكان له أجر شهيدين

If anyone of you passes away before the emergence of our Mahdī, he is a martyr. And a person who finds the era of our Mahdī and fights with him will get the reward of two martyrs.³

1 *Furū' al-Kāfi* 7/412; *Al-Tahdhīb* 6/218; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 18/4.

2 See the chapter of Taqiyyah.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/123, it is narrated in the *Amālī* of al-Ṭūsī as well (see: *Ibid*, 52/122-123).

Their scholar al-Baḥrānī has established a chapter in his book *al-Ma‘ālim al-Zulfā* with the title *Chapter 59: Regarding the Shī‘ah being martyrs even if they die upon their beds*.¹ Therein he cites multiple narrations.

Their exaggeration, as usual, than increases, to the extent that Ibn Bābawayh narrates the following from ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn:

من ثبت علي موالاتنا في غيبة قائمنا أعطاه الله عز وجل أجر ألف شهيد من شهداء بدر وأحد

Whoever remains firm upon our alliance during the absence of the Mahdī, Allah ﷻ will grant him the reward of a thousand martyrs from the martyrs of Badr and Uḥud.²

Likewise one of the injunctions is allegiance to the absent Imām being compulsory, to the extent that allegiance to him is renewed several times by way of prayers when visiting the tombs of the Imāms, as has passed. This is because the narration states:

من أصبح من هذه الأمة لا أمام له من الله جل وعز ظاهرا عادلا أصبح ضالا تائها، وإن مات علي هذه الحال مات ميتة كفر ونفاق

Whoever in this Ummah becomes such that he does not have allegiance to the Imām whom Allah ﷻ has appointed as an open³ and just Imām is misguided and lost. If he dies in this condition he will die a death of disbelief and hypocrisy.⁴

As for the greatest principle which they have invented during the period of occultation, it is the representation of the Shī‘ī jurist for the absent Imām. Owing to this artificial representation the Shī‘ī jurist has made many things permissible.

1 *Al-Ma‘ālim al-Zulfā Fī Bayān Aḥwāl al-Nash‘ah al-Ūlā wa al-Ukhrā* p. 101.

2 *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 315; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/125.

3 This suggests that their Mahdī is not an Imām because he is not open.

4 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/375.

The Shī'ah scholars, however, have differed as to the limitations of this representation. Some keeping it very limited whilst others establishing it to a very large extent, to the extent of representation in the highest levels of the responsibility; i.e. ruling a state and a referendum for enacting a state in the present country of the scholars, despite them not believing but in the explicitly nominated Imām. Due to the graveness of the idea of representation and because, at least according to me, it represents the 'definite' emergence of the 'Mahdī due to a very large number of their scholars claiming it, we will analyse it in the next chapter.

The Representation of the Hidden Mahdī

The foundations of the doctrine of occultation became firmly grounded, as has passed, and the existence of a representative who could be entrusted with the responsibility of taking charge of the affairs of the Ummah and who could serve as an intermediary and the Bāb to the Imām, who was absent in the basement, the mountains of Raḍwā, or the valleys of Makkah. Hence the first representative who took charge of the affairs of the Shī'ah after the demise of al-Ḥasan al-'Askarī, as has been mentioned in the books of the Twelvers, was a woman. And as Nabī ﷺ said:

ما أفلح قوم ولوا أمرهم امرأة

A nation who gives charge of their affairs to a woman will never be successful.¹

After the demise of al-Ḥasan al-'Askarī, the widespread news of his hiding son and the Shī'ah being left without an overt Imām, the Shī'ah began to ask who they should resort to. Hence in the year 262 A.H, two years after the demise of

1 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī: chapter of the battles: sub-chapter regarding the letters of Rasūl Allah ﷺ to Qayṣar and Kisrā: 5/136, chapter of tribulations: 4/527-528; *Sunan al-Nasā'ī*: chapter regarding utilising women for governance: 8/227; *Musnad Aḥmad* 5/43, 51.

Ḥasan al-‘Askarī, one of the Shī‘ah¹ went to his house and asked, Khadījah bint Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Riḍā as the narration states, regarding Ḥasan’s alleged son and who told him the name of the son.² The reporter mentions:

قلت لها فأين الولد؟ قالت: مستور، فقلت: إلي من تفزع الشيعة؟ قالت: إلي الجدة إم أبي محمد عليه السلام

I asked her, “Where is the boy?”

She said, “He is hiding.”

I then asked, “To whom should the Shī‘ah resort?”

She said, “To the granny, the mother of Abū Muḥammad.”³

Ostensibly the Shī‘ah wanted the representation of the absent Imām to remain within the family of Ḥasan al-‘Askarī and thus they told their followers in the beginning about the mother of Ḥasan al-‘Askarī being his representative. And it seems as if this appointment was in order to create the right milieu for the growth of this doctrine among the followers, because the mother of Ḥasan was his curator and naturally she would be responsible for his alleged son after his demise. However, the severe opposition of his household to the idea of a son, as will come, compelled the Shī‘ah to appoint a representative from outside the Ahl al-Bayt. Therefore the following narration of al-Ṭūsī’s *al-Ghaybah* mentions:

ولد الخلف المهدي صلوات الله عليه سنة خمسين ومائتين ووكيله عثمان بن سعيد، فلما مات عثمان بن سعيد، أوصي إلي أبي جعفر محمد بن عثمان، وأوصي أبو جعفر إلي أبي القاسم الحسين بن روح، وأوصي أبو القاسم إلي أبي الحسن علي بن محمد السمري

The Mahdī, the successor, was born in the year 256 A.H and his representative was ‘Uthmān ibn Sa‘īd. When ‘Uthmān ibn Sa‘īd died he appointed Abū

1 His name was Aḥmad ibn Ibrāhīm according to the narration. See: *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* p. 16.

2 It should be remembered that previously it was mentioned that according to the Shī‘ah taking the name of the Imām is tantamount to disbelief.

3 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 138.

Ja'far Muḥammad ibn 'Uthmān. And Muḥammad ibn 'Uthmān appointed Abū al-Qāsim ibn Rawḥ, who in turn appointed Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Samarī.¹

These four representatives were contested by others who also claimed representation from the household of Ḥasan. And their representation represents a personal relationship with the awaited Mahdī, which is why the era of their representation is known as the minor occultation.

The rights that these representatives enjoyed were very similar to the rights of the Imām in terms of obedience to them being compulsory and in terms of their reliability in transmission. In *al-Ghaybah* of al-Ṭūsī it appears that Ḥasan al-'Askarī said:

هذا إمامكم من بعدي (وأشار إلي ابنه) وخليفتي عليكم أطيعوه ولا تتفرقوا من بعدي فتهلكوا في أديانكم. ألا وإنكم لا ترونه من بعد يومكم هذا حتي يتم له عمر فاقبلوا من عثمان (الباب الأول) ما يقوله، وانتھوا إلي أمره فهو خليفة إمامكم والأمر إليه. فما قاله لكم فعني يقوله وما أدي إليكم فعني يؤديه

“This is your Imām after me,” saying this he pointed to his son, “and my successor, so obey him and do not disunite after me, for if you do so you will face destruction in your religion. Behold, you will not see him after this day till he completes a certain age, so accept from 'Uthmān what he is saying and stop at his orders, for he is the representative of your Imām and the charge of affairs will be in his hands.² Whatever he tells you he will be telling you from my side and whatever he submits to you he will be submitting from me.”³

In this manner did the Bāb receive the right to represent the Imām and take charge of affairs, his verdicts also enjoyed the credence of infallibility and sanctity due to speaking on behalf of the Imām and submitting on his behalf. Whoever opposed

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 241-242.

2 Ibid. p. 217.

3 Ibid. p. 15.

these four Bābs thus would be cursed and destined for the fire of Jahannam, as had appeared in the endorsed letters of the Imām regarding the deniers.¹

The idea of representation, then, accords these four individuals the prerogative to legislate because of them speaking on behalf of the infallible Imām who has the authority to specify, confine, and abrogate the texts of the Sharī'ah, as has passed. Hence the endorsed letters which they would produce would hold the same value as the verdicts of the Imāms or even more, as has passed.² It likewise gives them the authority to issue certificates of forgiveness and deprivation, and to collect the monies of Zakāh, Khums, and endowments.

But this representation came to an end when al-Samarri was asked to appoint a successor, for he said at that time, "For Allah is a matter which he is going to fulfil." Hence from then onwards the major occultation started.³

The agreement of the Shī'ah to terminate the status of Bābs at al-Samarri and to spread that amongst the people possibly was in order to safeguard the doctrine of the occultation from being exposed and revealed, for there were many Shī'ī scholars who aspired to assume the Bāb station, especially in the era of Abū al-Qāsim ibn Rawḥ, and disputes increased between them till it reached the extent of mutual imprecation, excommunication, and denouncement; as can be noticed in many of the endorsed letters which the Bābs produced attributing them to the Mahdī.

And thus al-Samarri deemed it appropriate to close the chapter of the Bābs.

At this stage another very crucial development transpired in the idea of representation specifically and in the Shī'ī dogma in general, and that is according the status of representation to the scholars of the Shī'ah in general, for the

1 Ibid. p. 244.

2 See p. 450 onwards of this book.

3 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 241-242.

Shī'ah agencies produced an endorsed letter attributing it to the Mahdī after the announcement of the termination of the Bāb station which stated the following:

أما الوقائع الحادثة فارجعوا فيها إلي رواية حديثنا فإنهم حجتي عليكم وأنا حجة الله

As for the newly arising issues, refer to the narrators of our tradition, for they are my evidence upon you and I am the evidence of Allah.¹

This letter announced the termination of direct communication with the Mahdī and the according of representation to the narrators of the Shī'ī tradition and the fabricators of their narrations.

This announcement accomplished many goals, the most crucial being this that the station of the Bāb no more remained restricted to one person, by way of which the spurious reality thereof could very easily be exposed due to many aspiring for it, for that was the cause of a lot of doubt and denial during the period of the minor occultation.

Likewise it circumvented the competition regarding the station of the Bāb which had already caused enough mayhem, and made it a common station for the scholars of the Shī'ah. It closed the door of exclusive representation and transformed it into a general representation which then marked the start of the major occultation. Hence the Imām now had two occultations: the minor and the major, despite their narrations only making mention of one occultation.²

1 *Al-Kāfī* (with the commentary *Mir'āt al-'Uqūl* 4/55; *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 451; *al-Ṭūsī: al-Ghaybah* p. 177; *al-Ihtijāj* p. 163; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 18/101; Muḥammad Makkī al-'Āmilī; *al-Durrah al-Ṭāhirah* p. 47.

2 Some of their narrations apparently were fabricated in the wake of the death of Ḥasan al-'Askarī, they portray the occultation of the alleged son. For example, "If you receive any news regarding the occultation of your companion, do not deny it." (*Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/340). This narration seemingly throws the idea of the occultation of the Mahdī without any emphasis in order to assess the reaction of the people and counter react with appropriate action. It also mentions that the Mahdī will only have one occultation.

The Shī'ah, however, had soon rescued the situation by inventing narrations which talked of two occultations. The inventor mentions:

قال أبو عبد الله عليه السلام: للقائم غيبتان أحدهما قصيرة والأخرى طويلة، الأولي لا يعلم بمكانه إلا خاصة شيعته، والأخرى لا يعلم إلا خاصة مواليه في دينه

Abū 'Abd Allāh said, "The Mahdī will have two occultations: one will be short and the other will be long; in the first only his special partisans will know of his whereabouts, and in the second only his associates in Dīn."¹

As you can see, this narration talks of two occultations: in the first only his special partisans will have access to him, which is maybe an indication to the vicegerency of the four representatives who successively claimed to be the Bāb. In the second his close associates had access to him, the narration of *al-Kāfī* suggests that they were thirty. But in both conditions the narrations do not deny immediate access to the Imām, whereas when al-Samarī assumed the station he produced an endorsed letter stating:

من ادعى مشاهدة المنتظر فهو كاذب

Whoever claims to have seen the Mahdī is a liar.²

continued from page 1208

Some of their narrations emphasise that he will return after this occultation. In *al-Kāfī* the following narration appears:

عن أم هانئ قالت: سألت أبا جعفر محمد عليه السلام عن قوله تعالى: فَلَا أُقْسِمُ بِالْخُنَّسِ الْجَوَارِ الْكُنَّسِ قالت: إمام يخنس سنة ستين ومائتين ثم يظهر، فما بعد غيبته إلا الظهور

Umm Hānī' narrates, "I asked Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn 'Alī regarding the verse, 'So I swear by the retreating stars -Those that run [their courses] and disappear,'" and he said, 'An Imām who will go into hiding in the year 260 and thereafter will emerge, for there is nothing after his disappearance but emergence.'" (See: *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/341).

Hence the announcement of al-Samarī of the termination of the station of the Bāb possibly indicated the imminent arrival of the Mahdī. But years have passed and he has not made his appearance.

1 Al-Nu'mānī: *al-Ghaybah* 113.

2 The text has passed on p. 460 of this book.

Likewise, their scholars mention that in the major occultation ‘the great deprivation from the Imām’ ensued. Their scholar al-Nu‘mānī makes the following remarks after talking about the two occultations:

هذه الأحاديث التي يذكر فيها أن للقائم غيبتين أحاديث قد صحت عندنا... فأما الغيبة الأولى فهي الغيبة التي كانت السفراء فيها بين الإمام عليه السلام وبين الخلق منصوبين ظاهرين موجودي الأشخاص والأعيان يخرج علي أيديهم الشفاء من العلم وعويص الحكمة والأجوبة عن كل ما كان يسأل عنه من المعضلات والمشكلات وهي الغيبة القصيرة التي انقضت أيامها وتصرمت مدتها

These narrations which make mention of the two occultations of the Mahdī are authentic according to us. As for the first occultation, it is the occultation wherein the vicegerents were appointed as open intermediaries who were present physically, at whose hands remedies in the form of knowledge, intricate wisdom, and answers to all the difficult and confusing questions that were being posed came about. This was the short occultation which ended and lapsed after a period of time. In the second occultation the intermediary in the form of the vicegerents was removed.¹

Despite this, the Shī‘ah scholars claimed to be representatives of the Mahdī during the era of the second occultation and they based their representation upon the endorsed letter which al-Samarrī produced from their awaited Mahdī and which ordered the people to refer to the transmitters of their tradition in all arising issues.

Hence it should be noted that he did not refer the people to the Qur’ān and the Sunnah, rather he referred them to the scholars.

Owing to this, the scholars thus assumed the station of the Bāb and thereby earned themselves sanctity and holiness amongst their followers. That is why they call their scholars who have reached the station of representation of the Imām ‘*Marājī*’ and ‘*Āyāt*’, for they are a reflection of the Imām. We therefore find one of their contemporary scholars asserting that denying any of the teachings

1 Al-Nu‘mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 115.

of the Imām is tantamount to denying anything from Allah ﷻ as in ascribing partners to Allah. This is all because of the idea of representation. Their scholar al-Muẓaffar:

عقيدتنا في المجتهد الجامع للشرائط أنه نائب للإمام عليه السلام في حال غيبته، وهو الحاكم الرئيس المطلق، له ما للإمام في الفصل في القضايا والحكومة بين الناس، والراد عليه راد علي الإمام، والراد علي الإمام راد علي الله تعالي، وهو علي حد الشرك بالله كما جاء في الحديث عن صادق آل البيت (عليهم السلام)، فليس المجتهد الجامع للشرائط مرجعا في الفتيا فقط، بل له الولاية العامة فيرجع إليه في الحكم والفصل، وذلك من مختصاته لا يجوز لأحد أن يتولاها دونه إلا بإذنه، كما لا تجوز إقامة الحدود والتعزيرات إلا بأمره وحكمه. ويرجع إليه في الأموال التي هي من حقوق الإمام ومختصاته. وهذه المنزلة أو الرئاسة العامة أعطاهها الإمام عليه السلام للمجتهد الجامع للشرائط ليكون نائبا عنه في حال الغيبة ولذلك يسمى نائب الإمام.

Our belief regarding a Mujtahid who is eligible for Ijtihād is that he is the representative of the Imām in his absence; he is the judge and he is the highest authority; he enjoys all the rights the Imām enjoys in decision making and conflict resolution; whoever rejects him has rejected the Imām, and whoever rejects the Imām has rejected Allah ﷻ; he is on the point of ascribing partners to Allah, as appears in a narration from the truthful (Ja'far al-Ṣādiq) of the Ahl al-Bayt. Hence a Mujtahid who is eligible is not just a reference in jurisprudential rulings, rather for him is all encompassing authority: he should be referred to in rulership matters and judicial matters. This is his prerogative specifically, no one besides him can assume his position but with his permission. Likewise it is not permissible to establish the capital punishments and discretionary punishments but with his permission. Likewise he should be referred to regarding monies which are from the rights of the Imām and his privileges.

This great position, or this all-encompassing authority which the Imām has accorded to the Mujtahid who is eligible is so that he may be his representative during his absence, which is why he is known as *Nā'ib al-Imām* (the representative of the Imām).¹

¹ 'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah p. 57.

As you might have noticed, the scholars of the Shī'ah have completely disassociated from the Ahl al-Bayt and have clung onto this fictitious and non-existent figure. They have, thereafter, positioned themselves in the position of the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt under the pretext of representing a non-existent person. This was a very big bonus. Hence we find that as soon as they united upon terminating the idea of the Bāb all their differences regarding it diffused and many of the Shī'ah returned and abided by this idea. Simply because it gave each of those Shī'ī figures the status of 'the Imām', 'the guided', 'the supreme authority' and 'the collector of wealth' in a way that no one from the Ahl al-Bayt would share these positions with them and nor would he expose them and their reality.

The representation which the Mahdī allegedly accorded the scholars of the Shī'ah by way of his endorsed letter was apparently restricted to representation in issuing Fatwās regarding newly arising issues because it states, "As for the newly arising issues, refer them to the transmitters of our tradition," as has passed, he did not grant them a fully-fledged representation. But the Shī'ah expanded this representation till it reached its pinnacle in these times at the hands of Khomeini.¹

This is also clear from the aforementioned statement of their scholar al-Muẓaffar regarding their belief in this regard.

Over and above this, their scholars have made sweeping claims regarding their connection with the Mahdī after his major occultation, as has passed.²

Analysing the Doctrine of Occultation and the Mahdī According to the Twelvers

All the Muslim denominations oppose the Shī'ah in the birth of the Mahdī, then how would they come to common terms with them regarding his puberty,

1 See the chapter regarding the country of the scholars in chapter four.

2 P. 461, onwards of this book.

his uprightness, his Imāmah, his infallibility, and his Mahdī status. Sadly, in substantiating any of the aforementioned the Shī'ah have no sound evidence,¹ as has passed in the previous pages when studying the various aspects of the doctrine.

The Ahl al-Sunnah thus conclusively conclude, in light of Shar'ī texts and logical reasoning, that the doctrine of the occultation of the Mahdī, based on its Twelver conception, is nothing but a fallacy, for no one has ever seen him or any sign of him, there is no information regarding him or any of his traces, no one has benefitted from him in worldly matters nor in religious matters, rather the harm and corruption which has overtaken the world due to believing in his existence cannot be known to anyone besides Allah, the Lord of the servants.²

The historians and genealogists have likewise mentioned that Ḥasan al-'Askarī did not have any children or offspring.³

Furthermore, they say that the Mahdī hid away in the basement after the demise of his father when his age was two, three or five—based on various narrations—and ever since he became the Imām of the people despite his childhood and occultation. Whereas according to the ruling of the Qur'ān, the Sunnah, and the consensus of the Ummah it is necessary for this orphan, if he existed, to be in the guardianship of his immediate family. Likewise it is necessary that his wealth be in the possession of a person who will protect it from him till signs of maturity are discerned in him. So how can a child who is restricted in his physical self and his wealth be an infallible Imām of all the Muslims in a way that no one's faith is complete until he believes in him?⁴ And how can belief in him be incumbent when he is non-existent or absent for such a long a period of time; a Muslim judge is required to get a woman whose husband is missing married so that her

1 Abū al-Maḥāsīn al-Wāsiṭī: *al-Munāẓarah bayn Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Rāfiḍah* p. 59.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/213.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/163.

4 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/163.

well-being does not go to waste, then how can the welfare and well-being of this Ummah be left to waste with the absence of the Imām for such an extended period of time.¹

Even if one turns a blind eye to the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding the Mahdī of the Twelvers and his occultation, if one is to carefully study the texts of the Twelvers themselves regarding the Mahdī and his occultation he will pick up an important point which is worth careful consideration. And that is that this claim did not gain acceptance in the ranks of the Shī'ah themselves but in a relatively belated time after the Shī'ah had made an effort anew to revive it by discarding the idea of the Bāb station which exposed the doctrine of occultation. Hence their scholar al-Nu'mānī, who lived during the period of the minor occultation, asserts that all of the Shī'ah besides a few were victims of doubt. Their doubt was because the signs of falsity were obvious to them, for Ḥasan al-'Askarī had passed away without issue, he was not known to have had a son because of which his brother and his mother distributed his inheritance.²

The following narration appears in *al-Kāfī* which is considered the most authentic book of their four early canonical works:

عن عبد الله بن أحمد بن خاقان قال... لما مات الحسن العسكري سنة ستين ومائتين ضجت سر من رأي ضجة واحدة مات ابن الرضا، وبعث السلطان إلي داره من يفتشها يفتش حجرها وختم علي جميع ما فيها، وطلبوا أثر ولده، وجاؤوا بنساء يعرفن الحمل فدخلن إلي جواريه ينظرن إليهن فذكر بعضهن أن هناك جارية بها حمل، فوضعت تلك الجارية في حجرة ووكّل بها بعض النسوة، ثم أخذوا بعد ذلك في تهيبته... فلما فرغوا من ذلك بعث السلطان إلي أبي عيسى بن المتوكل للصلاة عليه، فلما دنا أبو عيسى منه كشف عن وجهه فعرضه علي بني هاشم من العلوية والعباسية والقواد والكتاب... ثم قال: هذا الحسن بن علي بن محمد الرضا، مات حتف أنفه علي فراشه، حضره من حضره من خدم أمير المؤمنين وثقاته... ثم صلي عليه... وبعد دفنه أخذ السلطان والناس في طلب ولده وكثر التفتيش في المنازل والدور، وتوقفوا عن قسمة ميراثه، ولم يزل الذين وكلوا بحفظ الجارية التي توهم عليها الحمل ملازمين لها حتي تبين بطلان الحمل، فلما بطل الحمل عنهن قسم ميراثه بين أمه وأخيه جعفر

1 Ibid. 1/30; *al-Muntaqā* p. 31; *Risālah Ra's al-Ḥusain* p. 6.

2 See p. 1114 of this book.

Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd Allah ibn Khāqān narrates, “When Ḥasan al-‘Askarī passed away in the year 260 A.H the whole of Surr Man Ra’ā echoed the news of his demise. The governor sent people to his house to search it and all its rooms and to seal the house thereafter. They searched for any trace of his son, hence they brought ladies who were experts in identifying pregnancies, and they entered upon his concubines to assess them. One of them mentioned that there is a concubine who has signs of pregnancy, she was thus placed in a room and some ladies were appointed to see to her. They then started to make preparations for the burial. Having done that, the ruler sent a message to Abū ‘Isā ibn al-Mutawakkil to perform his funeral prayer. When he came close to him he opened his face and showed it to the Banū Hāshim, the ‘Alawīs, and the ‘Abbāsids among them, the generals, and the scribes. He then said, “This is al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Riḍā, he died a natural death on his bed.” From the servants and the confidants of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn many people attended his funeral. Thereafter the funeral prayer was performed. After his burial the ruler and the people began searching for his son and the investigations increased in houses and places. The distribution of his inheritance was halted. And those people appointed to see to the concubine who apparently had signs of pregnancy continuously remained with her untill eventually it became clear that she was not pregnant. Subsequently, he distributed the inheritance between his mother and his brother Ja‘far.¹

As you can see, the Twelvers cited this narration in order to point out the falsity of those Shī‘ah who stopped the line of Imāmah at Ḥasan al-‘Askarī refusing to accept his death, but simultaneously the narration also points out the falsity of the claim of him having a son. Because the family of Ḥasan, the guardians of the Ahl al-Bayt, and the ruler all investigated the reality of the matter openly in order to debunk what the Shī‘ah were claiming in this regard. Al-Qummī and al-Nawbakhtī have, therefore, documented that after the demise of Ḥasan al-‘Askarī, the Shī‘ah had split into many groups, most of whom denied the existence of a son,² to the extent that some of them said:

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/505; *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 41-42.

2 *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 102-116; *Firaq al-Shī‘ah* p. 96-112.

إننا قد طلبنا الولد بكل وجه فلم نجده، ولو جاز لنا دعوي أن للحسن ولدا خفيا لجاز مثل هذه الدعوي في كل ميت عن غير خلف، ولجاز أن يقال في النبي صلي الله عليه وسلم إنه خلف ابنا نبيا رسولا، لأن معجىء الخبر بوفاة الحسن بلا عقب كمعجىء الخبر بأن النبي لم يخلف ولدا من صلبه فالولد قد بطل لا محالة

We searched for the son in every way possible but we did not find him. Hence if it were permissible for us to claim that Ḥasan had a hidden son then it would be permissible to make a similar claim regarding any person who dies without issue. Likewise, it would be permissible to say regarding Nabī ﷺ that he left a prophet son, for the information of the demise of Ḥasan without a son is similar to the information regarding Nabī ﷺ passing away without a son from his progeny. Hence the claim of the son is completely false.¹

It was this hard fact, in my opinion, which compelled the Shī'ah scholars to invent narrations which communicated one of the characteristics of the Maḥdī to be the inconspicuousness of his conception and his birth and the suspicion surrounding them, in an endeavour to pass this period wherein the reality of Shī'ism potentially could be divulged.

Besides the stern disapproval of the majority of the Shī'ah, the Ahl al-Bayt also held an unequivocal stance in this regard which is one of the clearest evidences for the falsity of this doctrine, for it appears in *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* under the discussion of the events of the year 302 A.H (i.e. during the reign of the 'Abbāsīd Khalīfah al-Muqtadir) that a person claimed that he was Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn Mūsā ibn Ja'far, where after the Khalīfah summoned all the scholars of the family of Abū Ṭālib, at the head of who was Aḥmad ibn 'Abd al-Ṣamad, the chief of the Ṭālibīn at that time who was known as Ibn Ṭūmār, and the following transpired:

فقال له ابن طومار: لم يعقب الحسن. وقد ضج بنو هاشم من دعوي هذا المدعي وقالوا: يجب أن يشهر هذا بين الناس ويعاقب أشد عقوبة. فحمل علي جمل وشهر يوم التروية ويوم عرفة ثم حبس في حبس المصريين بالجانب الغربي

1 *Al-Maḡālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 114-115; *Firaq al-Shī'ah* p. 103-104.

Ibn Ṭūmār said to him, “Ḥasan did not leave a son.”

And the claim of this claimant had caused a lot of upheaval in the Banū Hāshim and they have said, “It is necessary to expose this man in public and penalise him severely.”

Hence he was made to mount a camel and he was exposed in the public on the Day of *Tarwiyah* (8th of Dhī al-Ḥijjah) and the Day of *Arafah* (9th of Dhī al-Ḥijjah). He was then imprisoned in the prison of the Egyptians which was to the west.¹

This testimony of the Banū Hāshim in general and the chief in specific is of paramount importance, because it is a testimony from the chief of the ‘Alawiyyīn who was very particular about keeping official records of each child that was born in the family.² And also because it was given in a very ancient time, i.e. during the period of the minor occultation, wherein the claims of this alleged Imām and his representation had immensely increased at the hands of various Shī‘ī figures.

Furthermore, over and above the testimony of the chief of the ‘Alawiyyīn and the Banū Hāshim, the closest person to Hasan al-‘Askarī—his brother Ja‘far—also emphatically states that his brother died without issue.³

The Shī‘ah concede this, instead they even assert that he confined his brothers consorts and concubines in order to ascertain whether they were pregnant or not,⁴ and that he very severely refuted any person who claimed that and called upon the Islamic empire of the time to take action against him.⁵ Al-Ṭūsī in trying to evade this says:

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* (al-Ḥusayniyyah publications: 1st edition): 13/26-27, (Dār al-Ma‘ārif publication):11/49-50.

2 Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb in his footnotes upon *al-Muntaqā* p. 173.

3 *Al-Ṣawā‘iq al-Muḥriqah* p. 168.

4 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 75.

5 *Safīnah al-Bihār* p. 162.

هذا الإنكار من جعفر ليس بشبهة يعتمد علي مثلها أحد المحصلين لاتفاق الكل علي أن جعفر لم يكن له عصمة كعصمة الأنبياء فيمتنع عليه لذلك إنكار حق ودعوي باطل. والغلط غير ممتنع منه

The denial of Ja'far is not worth consideration due to the consensus of everyone that he did not enjoy infallibility like the Ambiyā' owing to which he abstain from denying the truth and claiming that which is false. It was possible for him to make mistakes.¹

So al-Ṭūsī does not accept the denial of Ja'far because he is fallible, but simultaneously he and the Twelvers accept the claim of 'Uthmān ibn Sa'īd in proving a son and claiming his representation, whereas he is also fallible. Is this not a contradiction?

Why would Ja'far, who is the brother of Ḥasan al-'Askarī from the Ahl al-Bayt and the guardian of the Ahl al-Bayt after his demise, be belied? And how can a person who is a stranger to the Ahl al-Bayt and is suspected of lying, due to him vesting in his own monetary and popularity interests by claiming to be the Bāb, be believed? Should not a person whose status is such be doubted and should not his testimony be rejected?

It is due to this emphatic and stern stance of Ja'far against the endeavours of the leading Shī' figures in proving a son that the Shī'ah became agitated with him, so much so that they dubbed him 'Ja'far the liar'² and they fabricated narrations attributing them to the long gone members of the Ahl al-Bayt which carried their prophecies regarding the matter of Ja'far and warnings of staying away from him. So, for example, they have attributed the following narration to al-Sajjād:

كأنني بجعفر الكذاب قد حمل طاعية زمانه علي تفتيش أمر ولي الله المغيب في حفظ الله جهلا منه بولادته وحرصا علي قتله أن ظفر به طمعا في ميراث أبيه يأخذه بغير حقه

1 Al-Ghaybah p. 75.

2 *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 312; *Safīnah al-Biḥār* 1/162; *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/504; *Muqtabas al-Athar* 14/314. They said, "He is given the title Ja'far ibn Muḥammad al-Ṣādiq in contrast to this Ja'far whom they titled the liar or the inveterate liar (see: *Muqtabas al-Athar* 14/314). Hence it is very possible that the title al-Ṣādiq was accorded to Ja'far, the Imām, in order to spite his nephew Ja'far."

It is as if I can see Ja'far the liar pressing upon the tyrant ruler of his time to investigate the matter of the absent friend of Allah who will disappear into the protection of Allah, due to being ignorant of his birth and because of wanting to kill him and wanting to secure his inheritance from his father without any right to it.¹

We will notice in this narration that they have accused Ja'far of denying the birth of the Mahdī out of his greed for inheritance, as the Arabic proverb goes:

She infused me with her sickness and she escaped.

In other words, it was the fabricators of these narrations who claimed the birth of the son and subsequently claimed to be his representatives in their greed for wealth, as has passed. Similarly, the narration is contradictory, because on the one hand it claims that Ja'far will not know of the birth whilst on the other hand it states that he will be desirous of killing him. If he was unaware of his birth then how would he desire to kill a person whose existence is not known? Furthermore, one should also study how they defend the probity of 'Uthmān ibn Sa'īd and accuse Ja'far despite them claiming partisanship for the Ahl al-Bayt.

Moving on, Ja'far was not the only member of the Ahl al-Bayt who denied the birth of the Mahdī, rather their narrations suggest that denial had aroused in the house of the alleged son and from his paternal cousins. Evidence for this is the following narration which appears in the books of the Shī'ah:

عن إسحاق بن يعقوب قال: سألت محمد بن عثمان العمري أن يوصل لي كتابا قد سألت فيه عن مسائل اشكلت علي فورد التوقيع بخط مولانا صاحب الزمان صلي الله عليه: أما ما سألت عنه أرشدك الله من أمر المنكرين لي من أهل بيتنا وبني عمنا. فاعلم أنه ليس بين الله وبين أحد قرابة، ومن أنكرني فليس مني وسيله سبيل ابن نوح وأما سبيل عمي جعفر وولده فسبيل إخوة يوسف

Ishāq ibn Ya'qūb² says, "I asked Muḥammad ibn 'Uthmān al-'Amrī³ to convey my letter wherein I had many questions which were bothering

1 *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 312; *Safīnah al-Biḥār* 1/162.

2 Notice the Jewish names.

3 The second Bāb.

me. The response which came with the signature of the Mahdī¹ entailed the following, 'As for the question you have posed, may Allah guide you, regarding those who deny my existence from my household and my cousins, know well that there is no kinship between Allah and anyone. Whoever denies my existence is not from me and his end-result will be like that of the son of Nūḥ. As for the end-result of my brother Ja'far and his children it will be like the end-result of Yūsuf and his brothers.²

This narration tells us that denying his existence started from his household and his paternal family, and the claim of his existence started from the outside. So who of the two is more worthy of acknowledgement, can the nobles of the Ahl al-Bayt be belied, and an ego-centric figure who is not known to have any firm grounding in Dīn, knowledge, family background, etc., be believed?

It can be averred that maybe his household and his paternal family were concealing his matter in order to save him, however, the aforementioned letter which was issued by the alleged Mahdī posits that their denial was based on reality, because therein he asserts that their disbelief is like that of the son of Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام due to there being no kinship between Allah and the creation, the basis of their dogma being based upon the merit of the Imāms due to their kinship with Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ notwithstanding.

Likewise their vitriolic attack against Ja'far, dubbing him a liar and attributing every fault and blemish to him³ also posits that this denial from the family of Ḥasan was based on reality. Their denial specifically was the reason why the spearheads of this movement invented all those narrations which attacked Ja'far,

1 How would they know that it was the letter of the Mahdī, that is if he existed, when writings resemble writings and the person producing the letter is infallible and is suspected due to him vesting in his personal interests, more so when the one who is transmitting this letter from Muḥammad ibn 'Uthmān holds a Jewish identity.

2 *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 415; *al-Iḥtijāj* (printed in Najf in 1386 A.H.) 2/283, (Beirut print 1401 A.H.) 2/469; *Safīnah al-Biḥār* 1/163; *Muqtabas al-Athar* 14/316.

3 See p. 1216: footnote no. 2 of this book.

the household of the awaited, and his paternal family, warned against them and were replete with hatred for them. Nonetheless, their stance still had its effects in those times, for all of the Shī'ah had doubted this doctrine besides a few, as is attested to by al-Nu'mānī and others.

Apart from all of this, Ḥasan al-'Askarī himself, to who this fictitious son is attributed, denied having any son, for in his fatal illness he addresses his bequest to his mother and he gives the responsibility of taking charge of all his endowments and charities, he also makes the prominent people of the state and people eligible for testifying in the court to that, as is narrated by al-Kulaynī in his *al-Kāfī*¹ and Ibn Bābawayh in *Ikmāl al-Dīn*,² and others.³ Had he had a son who possessed all those supernatural and perfect characteristics it would not have been permissible for him to appoint anyone besides him, for a person who is the vicegerent of Allah in his creation, the ruler of the Ummah, a source of safety for the universe and the humans residing within it surely will be able to uphold the responsibilities of the endowments of his father and his charities despite his occultations. Hence not appointing him is a sign that he did not exist.

The statement of al-Ṭūsī that Ḥasan done so in order to conceal the matter of his son and save him from the ruler of the time⁴ does not in any way impact on this argument due to it being without any evidence.

Due to the aforementioned reasons the invalidity of his existence and whatever is based on it is completely clear.

This is the testimony of the Ahl al-Sunnah, majority of the Shī'ī sects, the chiefs of the Ahl al-Bayt, the family of Abū Ṭālib, his brother Ja'far, and Ḥasan al-'Askarī himself. All these testimonies and evidences debunk the claim of a son, they

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/505.

2 *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 42.

3 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 75.

4 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 75.

debunk the claims of those strange people who claimed to be his Bābs and to have seen him. How much more inevitable would the evidence then become when the improbability of his existence for centuries on end is added to all the aforementioned. If Allah ﷻ were to increase the life of any human due to the creation being in need of him he would have extended the life of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, as Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā mentioned. Not forgetting that till today no one knows where he is, nor is there any reliable person who can bring us information about him.

Whoever had to hide from an oppressive ruler due to fear for his life or for other reasons, the period of his hiding was short and was not unknown to everyone.

Furthermore, how can the first responsible person of the Ummah go into occultation for such a long period? Is this all not evidence of the fact that the doctrine of occultation is based upon a fairy tale which was invented by the heretics and haters?

Apparently there were monetary and political benefits behind this doctrine, for the greed for exclusively amassing wealth and the endeavour to make the Muslim empire crumble were the two main impetuses for the invention of this doctrine. And the evidence for this is that the language of money prevailed among the Shīʿī sects, money was the basis of their disputes and differences, as the books of the Twelvers have preserved, as has passed.

Likewise the issue of political dominance and Imāmah was the central discussion of these covert Shīʿī movements around which they revolved, and inventing the idea of a Hidden Imām would emancipate them from the Ahl al-Bayt and place control into their hands.

They hardly exhorted their intellect, deliberation, and contemplation in reaching this goal; because they had already found the basis of this idea in the Zoroastrianism, for the Zoroastrians claimed that they have a living leader whose anticipation they await, as has passed already.

Chapter Five

Raj'ah (The Return)

Raj'ah is one of the fundamentals of the Shī'ah dogma, one of their narrations state:

ليس منا من لم يؤمن بكرتنا

He who does not believe in our return is not from amongst us.¹

And Ibn Bābawayh mentions the following in his *Al-I'tiqādāt*:

واعتقادنا في الرجعة أنها حق

Our belief regarding the Raj'ah is that it is true.²

And al-Mufīd says:

واتفقت الإمامية علي وجوب رجعة كثير من الأموات

The Imāmiyyah are unanimous regarding the return of many of the deceased.³

Likewise al-Ṭabarsī, al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī, and other Shī'ah scholars assert that it is a locus of consensus between the Shī'ah,⁴ that it is one of the categorically established aspects of their Dīn⁵ and that they are ordered to verbally profess it,

1 See p. 62 of this book.

2 *Al-I'tiqādāt* p. 90.

3 *Awā'il al-Maqālāt* p. 51.

4 Al-Ṭabarsī: *Majma' al-Bayān* 5/252; al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: *al-Īqāz min al-Haj'ah* p. 33; al-Ḥuwaizī: *Nūr al-Thaqalayn* 4/101; al-Majlisī: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 53/123 (al-Majlisī has mentioned that the Shī'ah scholars are unanimous regarding this belief throughout the ages).

5 *Al-Īqāz min al-Haj'ah* p. 60.

believe in it and acknowledge it in their prayers, visitations, on Fridays and every given moment, just as a person is required to acknowledge the oneness of Allah ﷻ, the prophethood of Nabī ﷺ, the Imāmah of the A'immah, and the Day of Judgement.¹

The meaning of Raj'ah: Returning to the world after death.² Ibn Athīr mentions that it was a well-known belief of an Arab tribe in the days of ignorance.³

Many Shī'ah sects believed that their Imāms will return to this world: some acknowledged their death and believed in their subsequent arrival, whilst others asserted that they have not died but have gone into occultation and will return after a period of time, as has passed already in the discussion of occultation. The first person to espouse the idea of Raj'ah was Ibn Saba', he, however, believed that 'Alī disappeared, he did not die, and will return.

Initially the doctrine of Raj'ah was specific to the return of the Imāms according to the Saba'iyyah and the Kaysāniyyah. According to the Twelvers, however, it evolved into believing in the return of the Imām and various other people as well. Al-Ālūsī suggests that this important evolution transpired in the third century.⁴

Some Shī'ī sects even became known as the *Raj'iyyah* due to their strong belief in Raj'ah and lending it a lot of importance.⁵

As for the general understanding of the doctrine of Raj'ah according to the Twelvers, it comprises of three types:

1 Ibid. p. 64.

2 *Al-Qāmūs* 3/28; *Majma' al-Bahrayn* 4/334.

3 *Al-Nihāyah* 3/202.

4 *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī* 20/27; Aḥmad Amīn: *Ḍuḥā al-Islām* 3/237.

5 Ibn al-Jawzī has made mention of them as a distinct sect in *Talbīs Iblīs* p. 22. The following scholars have also mentioned them as distinct groups: al-Qurṭubī: *Bayān al-Fīraq* (manuscript) p. 3; 'Ālam Muḥammad Effendī: *al-Risālah al-Fīraqiyyah* (manuscript) p. 2; al-Salkhī: *Sharḥ al-Ithnayn wa al-Sab'īn fīraqah* (manuscript) p. 13.

1. The twelve Imāms, for the Mahdī will emerge from his hiding place and the remaining Imāms will be brought to life after their demise and made to return to this world.
2. The Muslim rulers who usurped the Khilāfah, according to them, from its Shar‘ī and rightful candidates, i.e. the twelve Imāms. These rulers will be raised, at the forefront of who will be Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Uthmān. They will be made to return to this world, as the Shī‘ah dream, so that retribution is taken from them, hence they will be punished, killed, or crucified.
3. Common people, more specifically, those who had pure faith, i.e. The Shī‘ah because they are only ‘believers’, as is conclusively suggested in their narrations and the verdicts of their scholars,¹ and those who were steeped in disbelief, i.e. all the people besides the weak and vulnerable.²

They have, therefore, said the following in defining Raj‘ah:

رجعة كثير من الأموات إلى الدنيا قبل يوم القيامة وعودتهم إلى الحياة بعد الموت في صورهم التي كانوا عليها

The return of many of the dead to this world before the Day of Judgement and their life after death³ in the appearances which they had in this world.⁴

1 See p. 775 of this book.

2 The term *Mustaḍ‘afūn* (weak and vulnerable) based on the Shī‘ī narrations and the opinions of their ancient and contemporary scholars refers to, as al-Majlisī says, people with weak intelligence like old women, dim-witted people, and their likes; it also refers to people upon who the evidence has not been established due to them passing away during the period of *Fatrah* (discontinuation of prophets) or who did not receive the news of the Imām. The fate of these people is left to the discretion of Allah, he can either punish them, or he can forgive them due to which there will be hope of salvation for them. (*Biḥār al-Anwār* 8/363; al-Majlisī *Al-I‘tiqādāt* p. 100)

3 Al-Mufīd: *al-Maḳālāt* p. 95.

4 *Awā’il al-Maḳālāt* p. 95.

And those who will return to this world will be:

النبي الخاتم وسائر الأنبياء والأئمة المعصومون ومن محض في الإسلام ومن محض في الكفر دون
الطبقة الجاهلية المعبر عنها بالمستضعفين

The last prophet, all the Ambiyā', the infallible Imāms, those sincere in faith, and those steeped in disbelief, with the exemption of the people who lived during the era of ignorance who are known as the weak.¹

Or in other words, as al-Mufīd states:

من علت درجته في الإيمان، ومن بلغ الغاية في الفساد كلهم يرجعون بعد موتهم

Those who have high ranks in faith and those who reach the utmost degree of corruption, all of them will return to the world.²

Likewise, the one who has to take retribution, even though he is not high in ranking will return and take revenge from his murderer.³

The period of the general Raj'ah will be, as their scholar al-Mufīd asserts, during the emergence of the Mahdī of the family of Muḥammad and his return from his occultation.⁴ However, one of their scholars avers that the general Raj'ah is not linked with the emergence of the Mahdī due to the Raj'ah being distinct from the emergence. Because the Imām is alive and in occultation, and he will emerge, if Allah wills, when dominion will not have been snatched due to which he will have to return. Hence the beginning of the Raj'ah will be from the return of Ḥusayn to the world.⁵

1 Jawwād Tārā: *Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-'Alawiyyah* 1/253.

2 *Awā'il al-Maqālāt* p. 95.

3 Karīm ibn Ibrāhīm: *al-Fiṭrah al-Salīmah* p. 383.

4 *Awā'il al-Maqālāt* p. 95; al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī: *al-Īqāz min al-Haj'ah* p. 58.

5 Karīm ibn Ibrāhīm: *al-Fiṭrah al-Salīmah* p. 383.

This is in harmony with some of their narrations which state:

أول من تنشق الأرض عنه ويرجع إلي الدنيا الحسين بن علي عليه السلام

The first person for who the land will split where after he will return to the world is Ḥusayn.¹

Some of their narrations state that the Raj'ah will begin after demolishing the room of Nabī ﷺ and removing the pure bodies of the two rightly guided successors of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, as they envisage, for their narrations state that the Mahdī said:

وأجيء إلي يثرب، فأهدم الحجرة، وأخرج من بها وهما طريان فأمر بهما تجاه البقيع وأمر بخشبتين يصلبان عليهما فتورقان من تحتهما، فيفتن الناس بهما أشد من الأولي، فينادي منادي الفتنة من السماء يا سماء انبذي ويا أرض خذي. فيومئذ لا يبقى علي وجه الأرض إلا مؤمن (أي إلا شيعي) ثم يكون بعد ذلك الكرة والرجعة

I will come to *Yathrib* (Madīnah) and demolish the room. I will take out its inmates fresh and alive and will order that they be taken to Baqī'. I will then order that two planks be erected whereupon they will be crucified. Subsequent to which they (the planks) will grow leaves which will confuse the people more than the first time. The announcer of the tribulation will announce, "O heavens throw, and O earth catch." On that day no one besides a believer (a Shī'ī) will remain. Thereafter the Raj'ah and the return will begin.²

The objective for the Raj'ah will be the vengeance of the Imāms and the Shī'ah from their enemies,³ namely all the Muslim besides the Shī'ah and the weak; the swords of the Shī'ah will be dripping with blood due to killing the Muslims excessively, so much so that Abū 'Abd Allah is reported to have said:

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 53/39.

2 *Ibid.* 53/104-105.

3 *Al-Īqāz min al-Haj'ah* p. 58.

كأني بحمران بن أعين وميسر بن عبد العزيز يخبطان الناس بأسياهما بين الصفا والمروة

It is as if I can see Ḥumrān ibn A'yan and Maysar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz dropping the people between Ṣafā and Marwā with their swords.¹

There is no doubt in the fact that specifying the holy Ḥaram for killing very strongly suggests that the Muslims will be the targets of murder, and that this is what the Shī'ah dream of doing. This narration and others of its like, their fictitious nature notwithstanding, give us an image of the thoughts of the Shī'ī figures who fabricated these narrations, and of their plans and goals; they are projections of a people whose endeavours were defeated and whose tendencies were subdued, of a people who wait for calamities to befall this Ummah.

These narrations which were being circulated clandestinely² also clarify the mass-murder that the Qarāmiṭah carried out upon the Ḥujjāj in the Holy Ḥaram. They would use this type of narrations which are falsely attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt in order to defend their positions of massacring the Muslims.

They also explain why the contemporary Shī'ah are enthusiastic about conquering Makkah and Madīnah as if they currently exist in the hands of disbelievers.³

Another prominent event which will take place during the Raj'ah is the accountability of people's actions at the hands of Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه. Abū 'Abd Allah says:

إن الذي يلي حساب الناس قبل يوم القيامة الحسين بن علي عليه السلام، فأما يوم القيامة فإنما هو بعث إلى الجنة وبعث إلى النار

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 53/40, attributing it *al-Ikhtiṣāṣ* of al-Mufīd, however I did not find it in the edition I had before me.

2 Because Raj'ah was one secret from their many secrets.

3 See the details thereof under the events of the year 317 A.H. in Ibn al-Jawzī: *al-Muntaẓam* 6/222, onwards; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/160; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 3/191.

The person who will be responsible for taking people's reckoning before the Day of Judgement will be Ḥusayn. As for the Day of Judgement, it is meant for sending people either to Jannah or Jahannam.¹

Likewise, during the Raj'ah the Ambiyā' عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, who are the paragons of Allah's creation, will be demoted to the position of soldiers in the army of 'Alī رضي الله عنه, as these fraudsters assert:

لم يبعث الله نبيا ولا رسولا إلا رد جميعهم إلي الدنيا حتي يقاتلوا بين يدي علي بن أبي طالب أمير المؤمنين

There is no Nabī or Rasūl who Allah has sent to this world but that he will return to this world and fight in front of Amir al-Mu'minīn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.²

Similarly, the Shī'ah dream that during the period of Raj'ah they will be living in such bliss and prosperity as cannot be imagined:

يكون أكلهم وشربهم من الجنة، ولا يسألون الله حاجة من حوائج الدنيا والآخرة إلا يقضي لهم

Their foods and drinks will be from Jannah.³ And they will not ask Allah for any need of this world or the hereafter but that it will be fulfilled for them.⁴

A Shī'ī will be given the choice in his grave to either return to this world or to stay in the grave. It will be said to him:

يا هذا إنه قد ظهر صاحبك فأن تشأ أن تلحق به فالحق وإن تشأ أن تقيم في كرامة ربك فأقم

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār*: chapter regarding Raj'ah 53/43.

2 Ibid. 53/41.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 53/116.

4 Ibid.

O you! Your companion has emerged, if you thus desire to join him, join him, and if you desire to remain in the boons of your Lord, then stay.¹

The Raj'ah for the Shī'ah will end with the killing of those who died naturally and the death of those who were killed previously. This end is stated as one of the objectives of the Raj'ah, they say:

ليس أحد من المؤمنين قتل إلا سيرجع حتي يموت ولا أحد من المؤمنين مات إلا سيرجع حتي يقتل

There is no believer who was previously killed but that he will return and die naturally, nor will there be any believer who died naturally but that he will be killed.²

Nevertheless, the doctrine of Raj'ah was a secret from the secrets of the Shī'ī dogma, Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Khayyāṭ, one of the scholars of the Mu'tazilah,³ states:

بأنهم قد تواصوا بكتمانها وألا يذكروها في مجالسهم ولا في كتبهم إلا فيما قد أسروه من الكتب ولم يظهره

They have sworn to keep it a secret and not to mention it in their gatherings and their books, with the exception of those books which they keep to themselves.⁴

There are narrations in the books of the Twelvers which indicate to the aforementioned claim of al-Khayyāṭ, for the Shī'ah narrate the following from Abū Ja'far:

لا تقولوا الجبت والطاغوت ولا تقولوا الرجعة، فإن قالوا لكم فإنكم قد كنتم تقولون ذلك فقولوا: أما اليوم فلا نقول

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 276; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 53/92.

2 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/131; *al-Burhān* 3/211; *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 4/76; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 53/40, see also: 39, 41, 53, 77 and 137 of the same volume; *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 407-408.

3 He lived before 300 A.H. (See: *Mu'jam al-Mu'allifīn* 5/223).

4 *Al-Intiṣār* p. 97.

Do not say *Jibt* and *Ṭāghūt*¹ and do not say *Raj'ah*. If they say to you that you used to say that, retort, "As of today we don't say."

In another narration which they attribute to al-Ṣādiq the following appears:

لا تقولوا الجبت والطاغوت وتقولوا الرجعة، فإن قالوا: قد كنتم تقولون؟ قولوا: الآن لا نقول، وهذا من التقية التي تعبد الله به عباده في زمن الأوصياء

Do not say *Jibt* and *Ṭāghūt* and do not say *Raj'ah*. If they ask you, "You people would indeed say those things?" Tell them, "As of now we don't say." This is *Taqiyyah* which Allah has ordered his servants to practice during the era of the successors.²

These were secret phenomena which the Shī'ah would discuss, and in order to infuse them with certainty and strength they attributed them to some of the members of the Ahl al-Bayt so as to mislead the laymen, the new-Muslims and non-Arabs.

Their Evidence for the Doctrine of *Raj'ah*

The Shī'ah focused their attention to the Book of Allah ﷻ in order to derive evidence therefrom to substantiate the doctrine of *Raj'ah*, a doctrine unique to them apart from the Muslims. When they did not succeed in their endeavour they resorted to, as is their wont, esoteric interpretations; they mounted the conveyance of exaggeration and recklessly contrived such evidences which rather became evidence against them, a proof of the falsity of the doctrine and the invalidity of their dogma. For this reality to become clear to us we are going to analyse some of their strongest evidences in this regard.

1 Al-Majlisī comments, "I.e. do not make mention of those two accursed men with these names, or do not make any mention of them." (*Biḥār al-Anwār* 53/40), in this he making reference to the two successors of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, his fathers-in-law and his beloveds; Abū Bakr and 'Umar رضي الله عنهما.

2 Ibid. 53/115-116.

Their leading scholar asserts in *Tafsīr al-Qummī* that the strongest evidence for the doctrine of Raj'ah is the following:

وَحَرَامٌ عَلَىٰ قَرْيَةٍ أَهْلَكْنَاهَا أَنَّهُمْ لَا يَرْجِعُونَ

And it is prohibited to [the people of] a city which we have destroyed that they will [never] return.¹

He says regarding the verse:

هذه الآية من أعظم الأدلة علي الرجعة، لأن أحدا من أهل الإسلام لا ينكر أن الناس كلهم يرجعون يوم القيامة من هلك ومن لم يهلك

This verse is one of the greatest evidences for Raj'ah, for no one from the Muslims denies that all the people will return on the Day of Judgment, those who died and those who never.²

Whereas this verse is against them, for it rejects the idea of returning to this world. It means, as stated by Ibn 'Abbās, Abū Ja'far al-Bāqir, Qatādah, and many others that it is completely impossible for a nation who was destroyed because of its sins to return to this world before the Day of Judgment.³ This is akin to the verse wherein Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى states:

أَلَمْ يَرَوْا كَمْ أَهْلَكْنَا قَبْلَهُمْ مِّنَ الْقُرُونِ أَنَّهُمْ إِلَيْهِمْ لَا يَرْجِعُونَ

Have they not considered how many generations we destroyed before them – which they to them will not return?⁴

And the verse:

1 Sūrah al-Ambiyā': 95

2 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/76: on the top of the page he has established the title: 'the greatest verse which proves Raj'ah'.

3 *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 3/205.

4 Sūrah Yāsīn: 31.

فَلَا يَسْتَطِيعُونَ تَوْصِيَةً وَلَا إِلَىٰ أَهْلِهِمْ يَرْجِعُونَ

And they will not be able [to give] any instruction, nor to their people can they return.¹

The additional لا (negating particle) in the verse under question is in order to emphasise the negation which is already conveyed in the word Ḥarām. This is one of the profound and eloquent styles of the Qur’ān which is very intricate. The reason why Allah ﷻ informs of there being no return is in order to clearly state that which troubles them the most and hurts them immensely, i.e. their everlasting destruction and the nonrealization of their biggest hope which is staying in this world forever.²

And even if the verse intends to prove a return it definitely proves the return of people on the Day of Judgment,³ i.e. them returning to us for recompense is completely impermissible.⁴ And specifically making mention of the impermissibility of them not returning despite it already being included indirectly in the verse:

كُلُّ الْيَتَا رَاجِعُونَ

Each one will return to us.

is because they denied resurrection.⁵

1 Sūrah Yāsīn: 50.

2 *Tafsīr al-Qāsimī* 11/293.

3 Some scholars have opined this and assert that this verse focuses at establishing faith in the afterlife; and it is a culmination for what appears before it, i.e. the verse, “Each one will return to us.” (al-Ambiyā’: 93). The ‘و’ in the verse will then be in its literal meaning and when coupled with Ḥarām it negates the negative which brings about a positive meaning.

The meaning of the verse will then be: It is impermissible for a destroyed nation not to return to the hereafter, it is rather necessary for it to return for compensation and punishment. Hence the verse is in place to debunk the view of those who do not concede the afterlife. (*Tafsīr al-Qāsimī* 11/293).

4 *Faṭḥ al-Qadīr* 3/426.

5 *Rūḥ al-Ma’ānī* 17/91.

Another verse which the Shī'ah use to substantiate the doctrine of Raj'ah is:

وَيَوْمَ نَحْشُرُ مِنْ كُلِّ أُمَّةٍ فَوْجًا مِّمَّنْ يُكَذِّبُ بَيِّنَاتِنَا فَهُمْ يُوزَعُونَ

And [warn of] the Day when we will gather from every nation a company of those who deny our signs, and they will be [driven] in rows.¹

This verse, as the exegetes of the Qur'ān have mentioned, is pertaining to the Day of reckoning and accountability, the day when people will stand before Allah.² The Shī'ah however use this verse to prove their doctrine of Raj'ah, hence their scholar Shibr states that it has been explained with their narrations of Raj'ah.³

And al-Ṭabarsī says:

استدل بهذه الآية علي صحة الرجعة من ذهب إلي ذلك من الإمامية بأن قال: إن دخول من في الكلام يوجب التبعض. فدل بذلك علي أنه يحشر قوم دون قوم وليس ذلك صفة يوم القيامة الذي يقول فيه سبحانه: وَحْشَرْنَاَهُمْ فَلَمْ نَعَادِرْ مِنْهُمْ أَحَدًا

Those of the Imāmiyyah who are of the opinion of the validity of the Raj'ah draw evidence from this verse and say, "The 'من' (lit. From) in the verse gives the meaning of 'some', which implies that some people will be raised and some will not. This will not be the case on the Day of Judgment as Allah ﷻ says, "And we will gather them and not leave behind from them anyone."^{4,5}

As for 'من' (in the first verse) at times giving the meaning of 'some', it is completely regular,⁶ for every nation comprises of acceptors and believers, so in light of this the

1 Sūrah al-Naml: 83.

2 *Tafsīr al-Qurtubī* 20/17; *Tafsīr al-Baghawī* 3/430; Ibn al-Jawzī: *Zād al-Masīr* 6/194; *al-Jāmi' li Ahkām al-Qur'ān* 13/238; Abū Ḥayyān: *al-Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ* 7/98; *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 3/393; al-Shawkānī: *Fath al-Qadīr* 4/153-154, etc.

3 *Tafsīr Shibr* p. 369.

4 Sūrah al-Kahf: 47.

5 *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarsī* 5/251-252

6 Abū Ḥayyān: *al-Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ* 7/98; *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī* 20/26.

verse would mean: On the day when those who belied our verses will be gathered from every nation from the nations of the prophets عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام or from the nations of any of the ages.¹ This interpretation of the verse does not in any way suggest any return to this world after death in any condition. But the Shī'ah due to not having any evidence which supports their doctrine resort to all the verses in the Qur'ān which talk of people's return to Allah سُبحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى in the afterlife and interpret them as Raj'ah.

Specifying the deniers with this resurrection does not necessarily approve what they claim due to it being in order to rebuke them and punish them after the general and all-encompassing resurrection of the creation.² As for the مَنْ in the second verse, it is explanatory, it is explaining the words 'droves'.³ One of the contemporary Shī'ī exegetes picked up the deviance of the Shī'ah in this regard and said the following in interpreting the verse:

من ههنا بيانية وليست للتبعض تماما كخاتم من حديد، والمعني: أن في الأمم مصدقين ومكذبين بآيات الله وبياناته، وهو يحشر للحساب والجزاء جميع المكذبين بلا استثناء، خصهم بالحشر مع أنه يعم الجميع لأنه تعالى قصد التهديد والوعيد

The مَنْ here is explanatory, it is not giving the meaning of 'some'. It is like when we say a ring from iron. And the meaning of the verse is: Nations are either acceptors of the verses of Allah and his evidences or their deniers, he will raise all the deniers for accountability and punishment without any exception. Allah, however, specifically makes mention of their resurrection because he intends to rebuke them and sternly warn them.⁴

One of the verse which they use is:

1 *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī* 20/26; see the previously cited references for the interpretation of the verse (footnote no. 42)

2 *Fath al-Qadīr* 4/154; *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī* 20/26.

3 *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī* 20/26.

4 Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah: *al-Tafsīr al-Mubīn* p. 441.

قَتَلَ الْإِنْسَانَ مَا أَكْفَرُهُ

Destroyed [i.e. cursed] is man; how disbelieving is he.¹

In *Tafsīr al-Qummī* the following is mentioned under the commentary thereof:

قال: هو أمير المؤمنين، قال: ما أكفره أي ماذا فعل وأذنب حتي قتلوه... ثم أماته فأقبره ثم إذا شاء أنشروه.
قال في الرجعة: كَلَّا لَمَّا يَقْضِ مَا أَمَرُهُ، أي لم يقض أمير المؤمنين ما قد أمره، وسيرجع حتي يقضي ما أمره

He said, “He is Amīr al-Mu’minīn.” Allah says regarding him, “What made him a disbeliever,” i.e. what sin did he commit because of which they killed him... Then Allah gave him death, and buried him. And subsequently Allah will raise him when he wants. Allah then says, ‘No! He has not as yet fulfilled what he ordered him,’ i.e. Amīr al-Mu’minīn has not fulfilled that which Allah ordered him with, he will thus return and fulfil the orders of Allah.²

There are few aspects worth consideration here:

Firstly, their scholar al-Qummī has interpreted ‘man’ in the verse: ‘destroyed is man; how disbelieving is he’ as ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, whereas the wording of the verse, and the context wherein it appears both determine that a disbeliever is meant by ‘man’, which is why the early scholars have said the following in the explanation of the verse:

May a disbelieving man be accursed, how ungrateful is he?³

1 Sūrah ‘Abas: 17.

2 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/405.

3 *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 30/54.

So is this interpretation aimed at satirising Amīr al-Mu'minīn subtly, or is it the aftermath of the influence of the Kāmiliyyah, a sub-sect of the Shī'ah,¹ who excommunicate Amīr al-Mu'minīn and the remaining Ṣaḥābah عليه السلام which the Shī'ah have imbibed, or is it that the fabricator of this interpretation is a non-Arab who is ignorant of the language of the Qur'ān and merely wrote what his fanaticism and heresy dictated to him.

Whatever the case maybe, it shows the lack of evidence which these people possess in trying to prove their point.

Secondly, he interprets the verse, 'And subsequently Allah will raise him when he wants,' which is emphatic regarding resurrection to mean Raj'ah. Apart from this being a distortion of the meaning of the Qur'ān, it averts a person who believes in these narrations from believing in the hereafter to believing in this innovated doctrine. It is for this reason that we find that many Shī'ī sects did not believe in the Last Day but rather believed in the transmigration of souls.²

In this regard it should be noted that the Twelvers have taken every verse of Qiyāmah and interpreted it with Raj'ah, and it has passed already that this has become a general principle according to them.³

Thirdly, these narrations suggest that the purpose for the return of 'Alī عليه السلام is due to him not fulfilling the orders of Allah. This is very slanderous, for it

1 Kāmiliyyah: They excommunicated 'Alī عليه السلام due to him not revolting against the Ṣaḥābah when they pledged their allegiance to Abū Bakr. They likewise excommunicated all the Ṣaḥābah due to them not acknowledging the right of 'Alī عليه السلام to leadership. According to al-Nāshī' al-Akbar they were known as the Kumayliyyah, they were the followers of Kumayl ibn Ziyād. He then goes onto mention their school of thought. According to al-Ash'arī, al-Baghdādī, and al-Shahrastānī they were known as the Kāmiliyyah. Al-Ash'arī states that they were the followers of Abū Kāmil. (See: *Masā'il al-Imāmah* p. 45; *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 14; *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/89; *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* p. 54; *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* 1/174).

2 *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* p. 272; Wellhausen: *al-Khawārij wa al-Shī'ah* p. 248; 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Wakīl: *al-Bahā'iyyah* p. 45 (footnote).

3 See p. 238 of this book.

suggests that Amīr al-Mu'minīn discarded the commandments of Allah ﷻ so that he could fulfil them after his return. Do they intend to liken him with the polytheists who will desire to return to this world after they will have witnessed the punishment which awaits them? How disrespectful are not these people to the Ahl al-Bayt.

Another verse which the Shī'ah use to establish the doctrine of Raj'ah is:

كُلُّ نَفْسٍ ذَائِقَةُ الْمَوْتِ

Every soul shall taste death.¹

They aver the following in the explanation of this verse:

لم يذوق الموت من قتل ولا بد أن يرجع حتي يذوق الموت

A person who was killed did not taste death, hence he will have to return to this world to taste death.²

This narration proves Raj'ah for all the people so that each one of them experiences murder and death, as they believe, whereas, as seen previously, they aver that Raj'ah will be specific to those who are pure in faith and those who are steeped in disbelief. Furthermore, this interpretation is due to being ill-informed in the Arabic language in which the Qur'ān was revealed, because it considers murder not to be a type of death which is mentioned in the verse. This unfortunately is the extent of their knowledge.

Besides these verses, the Shī'ah latch onto many other verses and interpret them with extremely esoteric interpretations, as is their wont in making excessive interpretations and attributing them to the Ahl al-Bayt to lend them

1 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 185.

2 *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī* 1/210; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 53/71.

credence. Hence according to al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī the amount of verses which they have interpreted with Rajʿah is seventy two;¹ therein their interpretations have reached unprecedented levels of artificiality.² Not forgetting that al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī does not cite all their substantiations in this regard, he rather apologises for not penning the rest down due to not having access to all their books.³

The Shīʿah also draw evidence from some of the miracles of the Ambiyāʾ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, of which Allah ﷻ has informed us in the Qurʾān. For example, the reviving of the dead by ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, or from all those incidents in the Qurʾān where Allah ﷻ discusses reviving the dead. One such verse is the following:

أَلَمْ تَرَ إِلَى الَّذِينَ خَرَجُوا مِنْ دِيَارِهِمْ وَهُمْ أُلُوفٌ حَذَرَ الْمَوْتِ فَقَالَ لَهُمُ اللَّهُ مُوتُوا ثُمَّ أَحْيَاهُمْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَذُو فَضْلٍ عَلَى النَّاسِ وَلَكِنَّ أَكْثَرَ النَّاسِ لَا يَشْكُرُونَ

Have you not considered those who left their homes in many thousands, fearing death? Allah said to them, “Die”; then He restored them to life. And

1 Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī: *al-Īqāz min al-Hajʿah* p. 72-98

2 In addition to the above-cited verses, here are some more examples which smack of their appalling indiscretion in this regard. Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī says, “The third chapter: verses of the Qurʾān which prove the validity of Rajʿah”. In this chapter some of the verses that he cites are the following:

وَلَقَدْ آتَيْنَا دَاوُودَ مِنَّا فَضْلًا

And we certainly gave Dāwūd from us bounty. (Sabaʾ: 10). See the previously cited reference: p. 92.

أَوَلَمْ يَسِيرُوا فِي الْأَرْضِ

Do they not travel upon the land? (Al-Rūm: 9) Ibid. p. 93.

وَوَصَّيْنَا الْإِنْسَانَ بِوَالِدَيْهِ إِحْسَانًا ۖ حَمَلَتْهُ أُمُّهُ كُرْهًا وَوَضَعَتْهُ كُرْهًا ۖ

And we have enjoined upon man, to his parents, good treatment. His mother carried him with hardship and gave birth to him with hardship. (al-Aḥqāf: 15) Ibid. p. 94.

وَفِي السَّمَاءِ رِزْقُكُمْ وَمَا تُوعَدُونَ

And in the heaven is your provision and whatever you are promised. (al-Dhāriyāt: 22) Ibid. 95.

This is the level of their substantiation and the height of their evidence. They have in doing so combined the innovative belief of Rajʿah and the interpolation of the meanings of the Qurʾān.

3 *Al-Īqāz min al-Hajʿah* p. 98.

Allah is full of bounty to the people, but most of the people do not show gratitude.^{1,2}

In this method of substantiation it seems as if the Shī'ah endeavour to prove the power of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, which is not the point of divergence due to no one ever denying any supernatural occurrence which is recorded and established through undeniable and mass-transmitted reports. The point of divergence, however, is the claim of returning to this world after death for accountability and recompense or retribution. This is so erroneous that there is no evidence to prove it, more so when one of the motives behind it is weakening people's belief in the Last Day. Aside from that, there is no dispute regarding the miracles of the Ambiyā' and the extraordinary signs of Allah in his creation.

Lastly, the anomaly in their substantiations reaches staggering levels when they assert that the clearest and most conclusive evidence for the validity of the doctrine of Raj'ah is the fact that no one besides the Imāmī Shī'ah³ believe in it.⁴ They say:

لم يقل بصحتها أحد من العامة (وهم ما سوي الشيعة الإمامية) وكل ما كان كذلك فهو حق. لأن الأئمة قالوا في حق العامة: والله ما هم علي شيء مما أنتم عليه، ولأنتم علي شيء مما هم عليه فخالفوهم فما هم من الحنفية علي شيء

No one from the commonality (i.e. everyone besides the Shī'ah) believes in the validity thereof, and whatever is of this sort is the truth.⁵ This is because the Imāms are reported to have said, "By Allah! You are not on anything which they are on, nor are they on anything which you are on. So oppose them, for they have nothing in common with the Ḥanīfiyyah (the pure religion)."⁶

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 243.

2 See: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 53/129; *al-Īqāz min al-Haj'ah* p. 131.

3 Those who believe in the line of Imāms.

4 *Al-Īqāz min al-Haj'ah* p. 98.

5 *Al-Īqāz min al-Haj'ah*. p. 69.

6 *Ibid.* p. 69.

It is owing to this that al-Ṭabarsī asserts that the unanimity of the Shī'ah in this regard is the greatest evidence in this regard.¹

However, the following should be noted regarding this substantiation:

Unanimity is not evidence according to the Shī'ah, as has passed. How can they then use it as the basis for establishing the doctrine of Raj'ah? But they might treat the acceptance of the doctrine of Raj'ah by all the Shī'ah without exception to be evidence of the fact that the infallible Imām is concurring with them and thus the credence of their unanimity. Because unanimity is only evidence for the Shī'ah when it reveals or leads to the opinion of the infallible.

However, the Zaydī Shī'ah report abundant narrations which emphatically exonerate the Imāms from the doctrine of Raj'ah and oppose the narrations of the Twelvers. It is for this reason that the ardent adherents of the Zaydī creed refute this claim very severely, and they debunk it in detail in their books.² So how do the Twelvers then assertively attribute the doctrine of the Raj'ah to the Imāms when the reports of the Shī'ī sects are at variance? Instead amidst the Twelvers themselves there are individuals who deny the Raj'ah and interpret the narrations thereof with the establishment of the Shī'ī state, as is reported by the scholars of the Shī'ah.³ Does any unanimity remain thereafter? And are the narrations of the approbation of the Imāms really authentic?

Furthermore, nothing has been reported regarding the Raj'ah from any of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم including Amīr al-Mu'minīn as the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, the Shī'ah, and the Zaydiyyah are unanimous in this regard. Had there been anything like the Raj'ah it would have been known and popular. The idea of Raj'ah was initiated by Ibn Saba', as is established in the books of the Shī'ah, who was an inveterate liar who was cursed by the Imāms, as is documented in the books of the Shī'ah and others.

1 *Majma' al-Bayān* 5/252; *Nūr al-Thaqalayn* 4/101; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 53/127.

2 Al-Ālūsī: *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī* 20/27; Aḥmad Ṣubḥī: *al-Zaydiyyah* p. 77.

3 *Majma' al-Bayān* 5/252; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 53/127.

As for the subsequent times, it was Jābir al-Ju'fī who opted for the sin of propagating it, he also, however, is suspected of lying in the books of the Shī'ah, let alone the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, as has passed.¹

Analysing the Doctrine of Raj'ah:

The doctrine of Raj'ah is in complete contrast with the text of the Qur'ān. It is completely false due to the assertions in many verses of the Qur'ān to the contrary. Allah ﷻ says:

حَتَّىٰ إِذَا جَاءَ أَحَدَهُمُ الْمَوْتُ قَالَ رَبِّ ارْجِعُونِ لَعَلِّي أَعْمَلُ صَالِحًا فِيمَا تَرَكْتُ كَلَّا إِنَّهَا كَلِمَةٌ هُوَ قَائِلُهَا وَمِنْ وَرَائِهِمْ بَرْزَخٌ إِلَىٰ يَوْمِ يُبْعَثُونَ

[For such is the state of the disbelievers] until, when death comes to one of them, he says, “My Lord, send me back. That I might do righteousness in that which I left behind. No! It is only a word he is saying; and behind them is a barrier until the Day they are resurrected.”²

The verse, “And behind them is a barrier until the Day they are resurrected,” is emphatic in there being no return to this world.³

أَلَمْ يَرَوْا كَمْ أَهْلَكْنَا قَبْلَهُمْ مِنَ الْقُرُونِ أَنَّهُمْ إِلَيْهِمْ لَا يَرْجِعُونَ

Have they not considered how many generations we destroyed before them – which they to them will not return?⁴

وَأَنْذِرِ النَّاسَ يَوْمَ يَأْتِيهِمُ الْعَذَابُ فَيَقُولُ الَّذِينَ ظَلَمُوا رَبَّنَا أَخْرِنَا إِلَىٰ أَجَلٍ قَرِيبٍ نُّجِبْ دَعْوَتَكَ وَتَتَّبِعِ الرُّسُلَ أُولَٰئِكَ نَكُونُوا أَقْسَمْتُمْ مِّنْ قَبْلِ مَا لَكُم مِّنْ زَوَالٍ

1 See p. 506 of this book.

2 Sūrah al-Mu'minūn: 99-100.

3 Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah p. 201.

4 Sūrah Yāsīn: 31.

And warn the people of a Day when the punishment will come to them and those who did wrong will say, “Our Lord, delay us for a short term; we will answer your call and follow the messengers.” [But it will be said], “Had you not sworn, before, that for you there would be no cessation?”¹

وَلَوْ تَرَىٰ إِذِ الْمُجْرِمُونَ نَاكِسُو رُءُوسِهِمْ عِنْدَ رَبِّهِمْ رَبَّنَا أَبْصَرْنَا وَسَمِعْنَا فَارْجِعْنَا نَعْمَلْ صَالِحًا إِنَّا مُوقِنُونَ

If you could but see when the criminals are hanging their heads before their Lord, [saying], “Our Lord, we have seen and heard, so return us [to the world]; we will work righteousness. Indeed, we are [now] certain.”²

وَلَوْ تَرَىٰ إِذِ الْوُقُوفُ عَلَى النَّارِ فَقَالُوا يَا لَيْتَنَا نُرَدُّ وَلَا نُكَذِّبُ بآيَاتِ رَبِّنَا وَنَحْكُومَ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ بَلْ بَدَأَ لَهُمْ مَا كَانُوا يُحْفَوْنَ مِنْ قَبْلُ وَلَوْ رُدُّوا لَعَادُوا لِمَا نُهُوا عَنْهُ وَإِنَّهُمْ لَكَاذِبُونَ

If you could but see when they are made to stand before the Fire and will say, “O would that we could be returned and not deny the signs of our Lord and be among the believers.” But what they concealed before has [now] appeared to them. And even if they were returned, they would return to that which they were forbidden; and indeed, they are liars.³

All the aforementioned people will ask Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى to return to this world at the time of death, when being presented before Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and when seeing the fire of Jahannam but their requests will not be exceeded to. It is for this reason that the scholars have considered the idea of Raj'ah to be the worst type of extremism born under the Shī'ism which is foreign to Islam. Ibn Hajar states:

التشيع محبة علي وتقديمه علي الصحابة، فمن قدمه علي أبي بكر وعمر فهو غال في تشيعه ويطلق عليه رافضي، وإلا فشيوعي، فإن انضاف إلي ذلك السب والتصريح بالبغض فغال في الرفض، وإن اعتقد الرجعة إلي الدنيا فأشد في الغلو.

1 Sūrah Ibrāhīm: 48.

2 Sūrah al-Sajdah: 12.

3 Sūrah al-An'ām: 27-28.

Shī'ism is all about loving 'Alī and giving him preference over the Ṣaḥābah. A person who gives him preference over Abū Bakr and 'Umar رضي الله عنهما is an extremist in his Shī'ism and is known as a *Rāfiḍī* or else he is known as a Shī'ī. And if vilifying the Ṣaḥābah and expressly hating them comes about with that, then he will be an extremist in Rafḍ. And if he believes in Raj'ah, the extremism then goes to a higher degree.¹

In the *Musnad* of Imām Aḥmad the following narration is narrated:

أن عاصم بن ضمرة (وكان من أصحاب علي) قال للحسن بن علي: إن الشيعة يزعمون أن عليا يرجع. قال الحسن: كذب أولئك الكذابين، لو علمنا ذاك ما تزوج نساؤه ولا قسمنا ميراثه

‘Āṣim ibn Ḍamurah (who was one of the disciples of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه) asked Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī, “The Shī’ah claim that ‘Alī will return.”

He said, “They are lying. If we knew that his wives would not have married, nor would his wives get married.”²

Believing in returning to this world after death for retribution or recompense is in complete contrast with the nature of this world which is not an abode for reward and punishment. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

وَلَئِنَّمَا تُنْفِقُونَ أَجُورَكُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ فَمَنْ زُحْزِحَ عَنِ النَّارِ وَأُدْخِلَ الْجَنَّةَ فَقَدْ فَازَ وَمَا الْحَيَاةُ الدُّنْيَا إِلَّا مَتَاعُ الْغُرُورِ

And you will only be given your [full] compensation on the Day of Resurrection. So he who is drawn away from the Fire and admitted to Paradise has attained [his desire]. And what is the life of this world except the enjoyment of delusion.³

1 *Hady al-Sārī* (the introduction to Faṭḥ al-Bārī) p. 459.

2 *Musnad Aḥmad* 2/312: Aḥmad Shākir states that the transmission is authentic; *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d* 3/39.

3 *Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān*: p. 185.

It likewise weakens a person's faith in the afterlife and the Day of Judgement which seemingly was one of the objectives of the doctrine.

This is actually represented by the interpretations of the Twelvers of all the verses of the Last Day with Raj'ah. Likewise it is represented in the impact these interpretations had upon some of the sub-sects of the Shī'ah which led them to denying the Last Day and believing in the transmigration of souls to which the doctrine of Raj'ah is the door. Not forgetting that some of their narrations also espouse the idea of transmigration.

Some research scholars are of the opinion that the doctrine of Raj'ah crept into Shī'ism due to Jewish and Christian influences,¹ it entered Shī'ism with the influence of the followers of those religions. Their scholar al-Ṣādiqī, a contemporary scholar, concludes that the doctrine of Raj'ah in its origins returns to what features in the books of the Jews² and has considered that to be a glad tidings for the Shī'ah.³

Ibn Saba' the Jew, had played an instrumental role in laying the foundation of this doctrine, as is equally transmitted in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah, but back then it was confined to the return of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام whose death he was unprepared to concede like the Twelvers in their treatment of the Mahdī who they claim is alive.

Apparently, the person who carried the sin of propagating the doctrine, generalising its horizons and interpreting many of the verses of the Qur'ān with it was Jābir al-Ju'fī, to the extent that the books of the Shī'ah have praised him for having thorough knowledge in the doctrine of Raj'ah. Hence the following appears in *Tafsīr al-Qummī*:

1 See: Goldzhier: *al-'Aqīdah wa al-Sharī'ah* p. 215; Aḥmad Amīn: *Fajr al-Islām* p. 270; Muḥammad 'Umārah: *al-Khilāfah* p. 159.

2 He has quoted some texts in this regard and he has attributed them to the book of Daniel: 12/1-13.

3 See: *Rasūl al-Islām fī al-Kutub al-Samāwīyah* p. 239-241.

Abū Ja‘far said, “May Allah have mercy on Jābir. His knowledge was of such a high level that he knew the interpretation of this verse, ‘Indeed, He who imposed upon you the Qur’ān will take you back to a place of return,’¹ i.e. the Raj‘ah.”²

In conclusion, the doctrine of Raj‘ah is, as al-Suwaydī asserts, against that which is categorically known to be part of Dīn, i.e. that there is no resurrection before the Day of Judgment and that whenever Allah ﷻ warns a disbeliever or an oppressor he warns him of the Day of Judgement.³ It likewise opposes the verses of the Qur’ān and the mass-transmitted tradition which emphatically mention that there will be no return to this world before the Day of Judgement.⁴

The Shī‘ah scholars, however, insist on approving it and they consider their anomaly in this regard to be a sign of its validity. Shayṭān has indeed beautified their actions for them and has dictated to them.

1 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 85. Ibn Kathīr says the following in the explanation of this verse, “Allah ﷻ instructing Rasūl Allah ﷺ tells him to convey the message and read the Qur’ān to the people. And Allah ﷻ informs him that he will be returned to his abode, which is afterlife, where he will question him regarding the responsibility which he had given him of Nubuwwah. And the meaning of ‘Imposed the Qur’ān upon you’ is that he imposed the propagation of the Qur’ān to the people upon him (see: *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 3/419). The word *Ma‘ād* (place of return) has been interpreted in other ways as well, all of which eventually return to approving the Day of Judgement (see: *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 3/420); also see: *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 20/123-126; *Tafsīr al-Baghawī* 3/458-459; *Zād al-Masīr* 6/249-251.

2 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/147.

3 But the Shī‘ah warn those who oppose them with the Raj‘ah.

4 Al-Suwaydī: *Naqḍ ‘Aqā'id al-Shī‘ah* (manuscript) p. 1.

Chapter Six

The Doctrine of *Zuhūr* (Emergence)

This refers to the emergence of the Imāms for some people after their demise and their subsequent return to their graves. Al-Majlisī has established a chapter by the title, *Chapter regarding them emerging after their deaths and extraordinary things occurring at their hands*.¹ Hence according to the Shī'ah the Imāms can emerge after their deaths and some people can see them. This emergence is not specific to a time like Raj'ah, rather it is subject to the intention of the Imāms, so much so that they have attributed the following to Amīr al-Mu'minīn:

يموت من مات منا وليس بميت

Whoever dies from amongst us does not really die.

Their narrations also mention that Abū al-Hasan al-Riḍā would meet his father after his death, he would receive advices and suggestions from him.²

One Shī'ī even narrates that he went to visit Abū 'Abd Allāh:

تشتهي أن تري أبا جعفر (بعد موته)؟ قال: قلت: نعم. قال: قم فادخل البيت فدخلت فإذا هو أبو جعفر

Abū 'Abd Allāh said to him, "Do you desire to see Abū Ja'far (after his demise)?"

He said, "Yes."

Hence he told him, "Stand up and enter the room."

When he entered the room suddenly he saw Abū Ja'far.³

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/303-304; *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* p. 78.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/303-304; *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* p. 78.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/303-304; *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* p. 78.

Another Shī'ī claims that he went to visit Abū al-Ḥasan:

أُتِىَ قَوْمٌ مِنَ الشَّيْعَةِ الْحَسَنِ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ بَعْدَ قَتْلِ أَمِيرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. فَسَأَلُوهُ فَقَالَ: تَعْرِفُونَ
أَبُو عَبْدِ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ قَاعِدٌ

Abū al-Ḥasan said to him, “Do you desire to see Abū ‘Abd Allāh?”

He said, “By Allah I desire to see him.”

He thus said, “Stand up and enter that room.”

And when he entered the room he saw Abū ‘Abd Allāh sitting.¹

And Abū ‘Abd Allāh is reported to have said:

أَتَى قَوْمٌ مِنَ الشَّيْعَةِ الْحَسَنِ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ بَعْدَ قَتْلِ أَمِيرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. فَسَأَلُوهُ فَقَالَ: تَعْرِفُونَ
أَمِيرَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ إِذَا رَأَيْتُمُوهُ؟ قَالُوا: نَعَمْ. قَالَ: فَارْفَعُوا السِّتْرَ فَعَرَفُوهُ فَإِذَا هُمْ بِأَمِيرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ
لَا يَنْكُرُونَهُ

Some Shī'ah came to visit Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ after the assassination of
Amīr al-Mu'minīn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and asked him (about Amīr al-Mu'minīn).

He replied, “Will you recognise Amīr al-Mu'minīn if you see him?”

They said, “Yes.”

He thus told them, “Lift the veil,” and when they did, Amīr al-Mu'minīn
عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was suddenly before them without doubt.²

This belief of theirs extends even further when they claim that the people who passed away centuries ago can emerge from their graves for them. The following narration appears in *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt*:

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 27/303-304; *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* p. 78.

2 *Ibid.*

عن عباية الأسدي قال: دخلت علي أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام وعنده رجل رث الهيئة، وأمير المؤمنين عليه السلام مقبل عليه يكلمه، فلما قام الرجل قلت: يا أمير المؤمنين من هذا الذي أشغلك عنا؟ قال: هذا وصي موسى عليه السلام

‘Abāyah al-Asadī says, “I went to visit Amīr al-Mu’minīn and there was a person seated by him who was in a shabby condition. Amīr al-Mu’minīn was paying attention to him and talking to him. When the person left, I asked, ‘O Amīr al-Mu’minīn who is this who is keeping you busy from us?’ He said, ‘This is the successor of Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام’.¹

Their narrations also state that ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would go to the graveyard of the Jews and he would address them:

فأجابوه من جوف القبور: لبيك لبيك مطاع فقال: كيف ترون العذاب؟ فقالوا: بعضنا لك كهارون، فنحن ومن عصاك في العذاب

They would respond to him from the bellies of the graves and say, “We are present, we are present, O the one who deserves obedience.”

He would ask them, “How do you find the punishment?”

They would say, “Because of disobeying you like how we disobeyed Hārūn. Hence we and whoever disobeys you will be in the punishment.”²

Their narrations likewise state that Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ emerged after his death to order Abū Bakr to obey ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ,³ likewise Abū Bakr and ‘Umar emerge for the Imāms in every season of Ḥajj so that they may pelt them whilst pelting the *Jamarāt*.⁴ It is therefore narrated that Muḥammad al-Bāqir once took five pebbles and threw them at a place besides the *Jamarāt*, and when he was asked as to why he had done so, he said:

1 *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* p. 81; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/305.

2 *Kanz al-Fawā’id* p. 82; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/306.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/304; *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* p. 82.

4 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/305; *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt* p. 82.

إذا كان كل موسم أخرجنا الفاسقين الغاصبين، ثم يفرق بينهما ههنا لا يراهما إلا إمام عدل، فرميت الأول اثنين والآخر ثلاثة. لأن الآخر أخبث من الأول

When the season of Ḥajj comes, the two sinful usurpers are extracted from their graves, they are then separated and no one besides the just Imām is able to see them. Hence I threw the first of them with two pebbles and the other with three due to the latter being worse than the former.¹

These are but some narrations which I have presented in this treatise. Al-Majlisī has mentioned that he has stated most of the narrations related to this topic under the following chapters: *Chapter regarding Barzakh (life in the grave), Chapter regarding the disbelief of the three, Chapter regarding the disbelief of Mu'āwiyah, and the Chapters regarding the miracles of Amīr al-Mu'minīn and the rest of the Imāms.*² Their narrations regarding this fallacy are thus abundant. Al-Majlisī has asserted that this emergence of theirs will be in their actual bodies, he then says:

والإيمان الإجمالي في تلك الأمور كاف للمتدين المسلم لما ورد عنهم ورد علم تفاصيلها إليهم صلوات
الله عليهم

Having over-all belief in these phenomena and consigning the actual implications and meanings thereof to the Imāms is sufficient for an adhering Muslim.³

Analysis of this Doctrine

I have not come across anyone who has analysed this doctrine of the Shī'ah despite it being popularly narrated in their narrations and reports. It is such a doctrine that merely presenting it is enough to show its falsity, for under no circumstances can it be in harmony with the authoritative texts, clear reasoning, and sound human disposition. It is an indictment to the Shī'ī dogma which

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/305-306; *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt* p. 82.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/307.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/307.

relegates it to those fallacious dogmas which were born in the minds of people. It is one of the many aspects of this dogma which clearly indicate to the invalidity of Shī'ism along with the doctrine of occultation, *Raj'ah* and *Badā'*. The copious narrations which they have in this regard strongly indicate to the proliferation of lies in their tradition, and to the fact that their narrations do not enjoy any authenticity whatsoever despite their abundance, as long as they support their fallacious beliefs which are refuted by reality. They are so fallacious that they are only reported by a small amount of Shī'ah, had they existed they would have been widely narrated by the Muslims.

The invalidity of the return of the dead to this world before the Day of Judgement is established through the divine texts and the consensus of the Ummah, as has passed. These fallacious beliefs upon which their dogma rests are considered to be from their flaws and disgracing assertions. It is probably the wisdom of Allah ﷻ that they have been exposed, for it is the system of Allah ﷻ that he disgraces and debases those who endeavour to attribute to him a religion that he did not reveal, as is established by the facts of history.

Chapter Seven

The Doctrine of *Badā'*

One of the fundamental beliefs of the Twelvers is believing in *Badā'* regarding Allah ﷻ, they have exaggerated so much in this regard that they have said the following:

ما عبد الله بشيء مثل البداء

Allah has not been worshiped with anything better than *Badā'*.¹

They also say:

ما عظم الله عز وجل بمثل البداء

Allah has not been glorified with anything like *Badā'*.²

And:

ولو علم الناس ما في القول بالبداء من الأجر ما فتروا من الكلام فيه

If people knew the reward which is contained in *Badā'* they would not stop talking about it.³

And:

وما بعث الله نبيا قط إلا بتحريم الخمر وأن يقر لله بالبداء

Allah has not sent any prophet but with the prohibition of wine and the acknowledgement of *Badā'*.⁴

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*: Chapter of Tawḥīd: Sub-chapter regarding *Badā'* 1/146; Ibn Bābawayh: *al-Tawḥīd* p. 332; *Biḥār al-Anwār*: Chapter of Tawḥīd: Sub-chapter regarding *Badā'* 4/107.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/146; Ibn Bābawayh: *al-Tawḥīd* p. 333; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 4/107.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/148; Ibn Bābawayh: *al-Tawḥīd* p. 334; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 4/108.

4 Ibid.

It seems as if the person who laid the foundation of this doctrine in the Twelver dogma is their scholar al-Kulaynī whom they title *Thiqat al-Islām* (the reliable transmitter of Islam) d. 328/329 A.H. For he has dedicated a sub-chapter in his *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* to it which he has placed under the chapter of *Tawḥīd*. Therein he has cited sixteen narrations attributing them to the Imāms.

He was succeeded by Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (d. 381 A.H) who also documented it as part of their dogma and established a dedicated chapter to it in his book *al-I'tiqādāt* which is also known as the *Religion of the Imāmiyyah*.¹ He has done the same in his book *al-Tawḥīd*.²

Their scholar al-Majlisī (d. 1111 A.H) paid a lot of attention to the doctrine of *Badā'* and dedicated a specific chapter to it by the title *Chapter regarding abrogation and Badā'*, therein he makes mention of seventy narrations from their scholars.³

This doctrine is also mentioned by their contemporary scholars in their books.⁴ Astonishingly, their scholars have written twenty five books dedicated to this topic, as is mentioned in *al-Dharī'ah*.⁵

Perhaps the Muslim reader will be appalled at this doctrine which is foreign to Islam and the Muslims, of which there is no mention in the Book of Allah ﷻ and the Sunnah of Nabī ﷺ, despite it being the greatest way through which Allah ﷻ is worshiped, the primary teaching of all the Messengers, there being such reward therein that if a Muslim were to know of it his tongue would be moist with its mention just as it is when professing the Oneness of Allah, as they allege.

1 *Al-I'tiqādāt* p. 89.

2 *al-Tawḥīd* p. 331.

3 *Bihār al-Anwār* 4/92-129.

4 Al-Muẓaffar: 'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah p. 69; al-Zanjānī: 'Aqā'id al-Ithnay 'Ashariyyah 1/34.

5 *Al-Dharī'ah ilā Taṣānīf al-Shī'ah* 3/53-57.

If we refer to the Arabic language to ascertain the meaning of *Badā'* we will find the following:

Badā, the verb, means to become clear; the matter became clear to him means that he developed an opinion regarding it.¹ Hence *Badā'* literally has two meanings:

First: Becoming visible after being invisible. It is said, for example, the wall of the city became visible (after it was invisible).

Second: To develop a new opinion. Al-Farrā' says, "*Badā lī Badā'* means another opinion occurred to me. And al-Jawharī says, "*Badā lahū fī al-Amr Badā'* means an opinion occurred to him in the matter."²

Both meanings feature in the Qur'ān. For example, the first meaning appears in the verse:

وَإِنْ تُبْدُوا مَا فِي أَنْفُسِكُمْ أَوْ تُخْفُوهُ يُحَاسِبْكُمْ بِهِ اللَّهُ

Whether you show what is within yourselves or conceal it, Allah will bring you to account for it.³

And the second meaning appears in the verse:

ثُمَّ بَدَأَ لَهُمْ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا رَأَوُا الْآيَاتِ لَيْسَ جُنْدَهُ حَتَّىٰ حِينٍ

Then it occurred to them after they had seen the signs that he [i.e. al-Azīz] should surely imprison him for a time.⁴

It is obvious that *Badā'* with both its meanings necessitates the precedence of ignorance and the subsequent realisation of knowledge, both of which are

1 Al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ: under the root letters 4/302 (ب د و).

2 Al-Ṣiḥāḥ 6/2278; Lisān al-'Arab 14/66; also see: al-Ṭarḥī: Majma' al-Baḥrayn 1/45.

3 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 284.

4 Sūrah Yūsuf: 35.

impossible for Allah ﷻ; attributing them to Allah is the greatest disbelief. How can the Shī'ah then claim that it is the greatest act of worship and likewise claim that Allah cannot be worshiped with anything like Badā'? Pure are you O Allah. This is indeed a very great slander.

This abhorrent meaning is found in the books of the Jews as well, for emphatic texts which entail the attribution of Badā' to Allah ﷻ appear in the Torah which the Jews interpolated based on their desires¹

Apparently it seems as if Ibn Saba', the Jew, tried to spread this belief which he had thumb-sucked from his interpolated Torah in Muslim society which he tried to influence under the disguise of Shī'ism and the call for the partisanship of 'Alī رضي الله عنه. This is because all Saba'i sects believe in Badā' and assert that every now and then otherwise occurs to Allah ﷻ.²

This doctrine, thereafter, moved on to the Kaysāniyyah or the Mukhtāriyyah, the followers of Mukhtār ibn 'Ubayd al-Thaqafī. It was this sect which became famous for lending importance to the doctrine of Badā' and espousing it amongst people.

1 For the example, the following appears in the Torah: The Lord seen that the evil of men increased upon the land... He thus regretted creating men upon the earth and his heart was troubled. And the Lord thus said, "I will certainly destroy men whom I had created upon the face of this earth..." (Book of Genesis: the sixth chapter: paragraph no. 5) This type of false phenomenon features frequently in their Torah. See: the Book of Exodus: chapter 32: paragraph no. 12-14; the Book of Judges: second chapter: paragraph no. 18; Book one of Samuel: chapter fifteen: paragraph no. 10 and 34; Book two of Samuel: chapter 24: paragraph no. 16; Book one of Chronicles: chapter 21: paragraph no. 1; Book of Jeremiah: chapter 42: paragraph no. 10; Book of Amos: chapter 7: paragraph 3; Book of Jonah: chapter 3: paragraph no. 10.

This is what appears in the Torah of the Jews, whereas they do not believe in abrogation since, according to them, it leads to Badā'. (*Masā'il al-Imāmah* p. 75; *Manāhil al-'Irḥān* 2/78). See their contradiction and see how they refute the truth and accept falsehood.

2 Al-Malaṭī: *al-Tanbīh wa al-Radd* p. 19.

The Heresiographers write that the reason why the Kaysāniyyah considered it permissible to attribute Badā' to Allah *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى* is the following:

إن مصعب بن الزبير أرسل جيشاً قويا لقتال المختار وأتباعه فبعث المختار إلي قتالهم أحمد بن شميظ مع ثلاثة آلاف من المقاتلة وقال لهم: أوحى إلي أن الظفر يكون لكم فهزم ابن شميظ فيمن كان معه فعادوا إليه فقالوا: أين الظفر الذي قد وعدتنا؟ فقال المختار: هكذا كان قد وعدني ثم بدا فإنه سبحانه وتعالى قد قال: يَمْحُو اللَّهُ مَا يَشَاءُ وَيُثَبِّتُ ۖ وَعِنْدَهُ أُمُّ الْكِتَابِ

Muṣ'ab ibn Zubair sent a powerful army to combat Mukhtār and his people, so Mukhtār sent Aḥmad ibn Shamīṭ to fight them with three thousand warriors and told them, "It has been revealed to me that victory will be for you."

However, Ibn Shamīṭ was defeated with those who were with him and subsequently returned to him and asked, "Where is the victory that you had promised us?"

He said, "That is what He had promised me, but then otherwise occurred to Him, for verily Allah says, Allah eliminates what He wills or confirms, and with Him is the Mother of the Book."^{1,2}

The reason, as you can see, for Badā' was Mukhtār claiming to have knowledge of the unseen and of events to happen in the future. And subsequently when things transpired against what he had foretold he said, "It has occurred to your Lord."

This very same phenomenon is found in the books of the Twelvers, for they propagated to their followers that the Imāms possess knowledge of the past and the future and that nothing is hidden from them.³ Subsequently, when they attributed foretellings to the Imāms which did not materialise they said that this is due to Badā'.

1 Sūrah al-Ra'd: 39.

2 Al-Isfarā'īnī: *al-Tabṣīr fī al-Dīn* p. 20; al-Baghdādī: *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* p. 50-52.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*: chapter: the Imāms possess knowledge of the past and the future and that nothing is hidden from him 1/260.

The following narration appears in *Bihār* under the chapter of Badā’:

قال أبو جعفر وأبو عبد الله عليهما السلام: يا أبا حمزة إن حدثناك بأمر أنه يجيء من ههنا فجاء من ههنا فإن الله يصنع ما يشاء. وإن حدثناك بحديث وحدثناك غدا بخلافه فإن الله يمحو ما يشاء ويثبت

Abū Ja‘far and Abū ‘Abd Allāh عَلَيْهِمَا السَّلَام said, “O Abū Ḥamzah, if we tell you of a matter that it is going to come from here and it ends up coming from there, certainly Allah does as He wishes. And if we tell you of something today and the next day we tell you something in complete contrast with it, Allah erases what he wants and he keeps what he wants.”¹

The scholars of the Shī‘ah would give false hopes to their followers that one day, eventually, power will return to them, so much so that they had promised that it would return within seventy years according to one narration which they attribute to Abū Ja‘far. But when the seventy years passed and nothing came to being and the followers complained, the spearheaders of the dogma very conveniently found a way out by asserting that otherwise occurred to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى which demanded that He change His promise.²

Likewise the narrations of the Shī‘ah which were being circulated during the lifetime of Ja‘far al-Šādiq, and which they attributed to him, foretold that Ismā‘īl, the son of Ja‘far, will be the Imām after him. But when things did not go as planned with Ismā‘īl passing away during the lifetime of his father, it posed a big threat to the Shī‘ah and the biggest split in the history of Shī‘ism which remains to date occurred; i.e. the defection of a very big group of the Shī‘ah and their assertion that Ismā‘īl is the Imām; they are known as the Ismā‘īliyyah. This defection happened even though they had resorted to Badā’ in order to resolve this conundrum. Hence they attributed narrations to Ja‘far, narrations which stated:

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 4/119; *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/217; *al-Burhān* 2/299.

2 *Tafsīr al-‘Ayyāshī* 2/218; *al-Ṭūsī*; *al-Ghaybah* p. 263; *Bihār al-Anwār* 4/214.

ما بدا لله بداء كما بدا له في إسماعيل ابني... إذ اخترمه قبلي ليعلم أنه ليس بإمام بعدي

Nothing has ever occurred to Allah as has occurred to him regarding my son Ismā'īl, for He took him away before me only to realise that there is no Imām after me.¹

The Twelvers had accepted this interpretation of the problem and accepted his brother, Mūsā, as the Imām instead of Ismā'īl.

Similarly, the founding-fathers of Shī'ism claimed that their Imāms had knowledge of events that happened, events that are to happen, the lives of people, and their destinies; but the followers and other people did not see any of this in them, nor did the Imāms ever inform of any of these things, because they were never the prerogative of the Imāms, nor did they claim that for themselves. Hence the founding fathers did not find anything by way of which they could justify this inability besides the doctrine of Badā'. Hence they have narrated from their Imāms that they would not inform people of the unseen because they feared that otherwise would occur to Allah owing to which he would change his decision.²

They also claim that the Imāms were given the knowledge of life, sustenance, calamities, afflictions, and sickness but with the condition of Badā' (i.e. otherwise occurring to Allah).³ This was another ploy which they deployed to cover their lies when they were exposed with incidents not happening as previously informed.

It is due to the nature of this belief that the Shī'ah have ordered their followers to accept these contradictions, differences, and lies. In a lengthy narration which

1 Ibn Bābawayh: *al-Tawhīd* p. 336; see also: *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/327.

2 For example, they have attributed the following to 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn:

لولا البداء لحدثتكم بما يكون إلي يوم القيامة

If it was not for Badā', I would have told you of everything to happen till the Day of Judgement.

(See: *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī* 2/215; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 4/118).

3 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/290; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 4/101.

appears in *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, which talks of the end of the Abbasid Dynasty, the following appears:

إذا حدثناكم بشيء فكان كما نقول فقولوا صدق الله ورسوله. وإن كان بخلاف ذلك فقولوا: صدق الله ورسوله توجروا مرتين

When we inform you of something and it happens as we inform you, say, “Allah and His Rasūl spoke the truth.” And if it happens against that, say, “Allah and His Rasūl spoke the truth.” You will get double the reward.¹

In the wake of the doctrine of Badā’ signs of doubt already began to envelope the intelligent among the Shī’ah; some of them had already picked up on how the game was being played and had thus denounced the Imāmī dogma completely. Some of the books of heresiography have recorded the story of at least one such person whose name was Sulaymān ibn Jarīr, the eponym of the Sulaymāniyyah, a sub-sect of the Zaydiyyah. He is thus recorded to have said the following:

إن أئمة الرافضة وضعوا لشيعتهم مقاتلين لا يظهرون معهما من أئمتهم علي كذب أبدا. وهما القول بالبداء وإجازة التقية

The leaders of the Rāfiḍah have invented two such beliefs for their followers that make it impossible to ever pick-up the lies of their leaders because of it, they are: believing in Badā’ and Taqiyyah.²

Subsequent to that, whilst living in the Shī’ society and associating with them he picked up how they use Badā’ as a cover up for their false attribution of the knowledge of the unseen to the Imāms. He thus says:

إن أئمتهم لما أحلوا أنفسهم من شيعتهم محل الأنبياء من رعبتها في العلم فيما كان وما يكون، والأخبار بما يكون في غد، وقالوا لشيعتهم أنه سيكون غدا وفي غابر الأيام كذا كذا، فإن جاء ذلك الشيء علي ما قالوه قالوا لهم: ألم نعلمكم أن هذا يكون فنحن نعلم من قبل الله عز وجل ما علمته الأنبياء. وبيننا وبين

1 *Tafsīr al-Qummī* 2/290; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 4/101.

2 *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 78; *Firaq al-Shī’ah* of al-Nawbakhtī p. 64.

الله عزوجل مثل تلك الأسباب التي علمت بها الأنبياء عن الله ما علمت. وإن لم يكن ذلك الشيء الذي قالوا أنه يكون علي ما قالوه، قالوا لشييعتهم: بدا لله في ذلك فلم يكونه

When their Imāms accorded themselves the status which the prophets enjoyed among their people in terms of having knowledge of the past and the future and information of what is to happen the next day, and when they told their partisans that such and such an event is going to happen tomorrow and such and such an event happened previously. Then when that particular incident happened as they informed they would say “Did we not tell you that this was going to happen, for we know from Allah ﷺ what the prophets knew; and between us and Allah ﷺ are the very same mediums of knowledge through which the prophets received knowledge.” And if it happens against what they had communicated to their people they would say, “Otherwise occurred to Allah and thus he did not let it materialise.”¹

He then goes onto explain how they deceive their followers through the belief of Taqiyyah, where after some of the Shī'ah were convinced and they followed him.²

Having read this, you might have realised that if the doctrine of Badā' falls away the Twelver dogma is destroyed from its very roots. This is because all their narrations and promises which did not materialise debunks the status of Imāmāh for their supposed Imāms.

This is the reason for which the Shī'ah scholars are so enthusiastic about the issue of Badā' and why they defend it so fervently and consider it to be the greatest of all devotions.

1 *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 78; *Firaq al-Shī'ah* p. 64-65. Also see: al-Rāzī: *Muḥaṣṣal Afkār al-Mutaqaddimīn wa al-Muta'akhirīn* p. 249. Although Sulaymān ibn Jarīr attributes this deception to the Ahl al-Bayt, it was these heretics who were in reality exploiting the name of the Ahl al-Bayt to amass wealth wrongly and to plan and plot against Islam.

2 *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* p. 78; *Firaq al-Shī'ah* p. 65.

However, the doctrine of Badā' brought about the most disastrous result for them, i.e. a new reason for their disbelief and apostasy.¹ Because thereby they endeavoured to exonerate the creation, i.e. the Imām, from his foretellings not being true, from there being contradictions in his statements, from change in his opinion, and the development of a new opinion; but they attributed all of that to the Knower of the visible and the unseen. Pure is Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى from what the transgressors attribute to Him.²

Hence they exonerated the creation but not the creator. This was probably because their exaggerations regarding the Imāms did not leave any respect in their hearts for Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى owing to which they became victims of this grave disbelief.

The scholars of the Shī'ah have tried to somehow or the other find a way out of this shameful stance and an escape from this disbelief.

We thus find that al-Naṣīr al-Ṭūsī d. 672 A.H, whom al-Majlisī accorded the title *Muḥaqqiq* (research scholar), denied the existence of Badā' as a doctrine of the Twelver dogma and averred thusly:

إنهم لا يقولون بالبداء وإنما القول بالبداء ما كان إلا رواية رووها عن جعفر الصادق أنه جعل إسماعيل القائم مقامه، فظهر من إسماعيل ما لم يرتضه منه، فجعل القائم موسي. فستل عن ذلك فقال: بدا لله في أمر إسماعيل وهذه رواية وعندهم أن الخبر الواحد لا يوجب علما ولا عملا

They do not believe in Badā', approving Badā' was not but due to one narration which they narrated from Ja'far al-Ṣādiq when he appointed his son Ismā'īl as his successor. But Ismā'īl expressed certain things which Ja'far did not like about him and he thus appointed Mūsā as his successor. And when he was asked about that he said, "Otherwise occurred to Allah regarding the matter of Ismā'īl. This is just a mere narration; it has been transmitted to us through a single transmission

1 Al-Ghazālī: *al-Mustaṣfā* 1/110.

2 *Al-Washī'ah* p. 172.

which does not give the benefit of certainty and does not yield the requirement of practice.¹

But this, as you might have noticed, is against reality, for Badā' is certainly from one of their established beliefs, of which their narrations and reports talk abundantly. Al-Majlisī, therefore, asserts that it is indeed an eerie response from al-Ṭūsī, and he asserts that it is on account of him not having a comprehensive grasp over the narrations.²

Whilst on the other hand, we find another group of Shī'ah who acknowledge the doctrine of Badā' but try to interpret it with an interpretation which is viable.

Hence Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī tries to interpret their narrations in a way which smacks of confusion. Initially he says:

ليس البداء كما يظنه جهال الناس بأنه بداء ندامة تعالي الله عن ذلك، ولكنه يجب علينا أن نقر لله عز وجل بأن له البداء معناه أن له أن يبدأ بشيء من خلقه فيخلقه قبل شيء ثم يعدم ذلك الشيء و يبدأ بخلق غيره

It is not the Badā' which the ignorant understand it to be, i.e. the Badā' which brings about regret, for Allah is Pure from that. But what it means is that it is necessary for us to concede that for Allah ﷻ there is Badā' in the sense that he has the prerogative to start creating something which he can thereafter destroy and subsequently start to create something else in its stead.³

As you might have noticed, his discussion here is unrelated to the subject under the discussion, for he is talking of Badā' (which means starting to do something) and not of Badā' (which is the occurrence of another view after having previously asserted otherwise). No Muslim disputes what he has stated above, if this was what they really meant by Badā' no one would have denied it, nor would they

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *Talkhīṣ al-Muḥaṣṣal* p. 250.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 4/123.

3 *al-Tawḥīd* p. 335.

look for ways to resolve the contradiction which overwhelms their narrations or for ways to explain the nonrealization of their foretellings.

Allah ﷻ says:

وَبَدَأَ خَلْقَ الْإِنْسَانِ مِن طِينٍ

And began the creation of man from clay.¹

إِنَّهُ يَبْدَأُ الْخَلْقَ ثُمَّ يُعِيدُهُ

He begins the [process of] creation and then repeats it.²

وَرَبُّكَ يَخْلُقُ مَا يَشَاءُ وَيَخْتَارُ

And your Lord creates what He wills and chooses.³

He, thereafter, recants his previous assertion and explains Badā' to be abrogation. Hence after his previous explanation he states the following:

أَوْ يَأْمُرُ بِأَمْرٍ ثُمَّ يَنْهَى عَنْ مِثْلِهِ أَوْ يَنْهَى عَنْ شَيْءٍ ثُمَّ يَأْمُرُ بِمِثْلِ مَا نَهَى عَنْهُ وَذَلِكَ مِثْلُ نَسْخِ الشَّرَائِعِ وَتَحْوِيلِ الْقِبْلَةِ وَعِدَةِ الْمَتَوَفَّى عَنْهَا زَوْجَهَا

Or he orders something and then prohibits from something of its like, or he prohibits from something and orders something of its sort. It is just like abrogating rulings of the Sharī'ah, changing the direction of the Qiblah and the waiting period of a woman whose husband passes away.⁴

But this is either ignorance or portraying ignorance. Because there is no Badā' in abrogation wherein a ruling has a specific time in the Knowledge of Allah

1 Sūrah al-Sajdah: 7.

2 Sūrah Yūnus: 4.

3 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 68.

4 *al-Tawhīd* p. 335.

wherein He سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has prior knowledge of the ruling ending before its allocated time even approaches. Yes, in terms of the relationship of the abrogation to us it becomes clear to us after the abrogating ruling is revealed, but not to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.¹

Hence Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is pure from being described with Badā', because the concept of Badā' is in stark contrast with the All Encompassing Knowledge of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. Allah is not free from abrogation, because abrogation is only stating the end of the period of the first ruling as per its previous existence in the Knowledge of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, even though according to us the revelation thereof for us is an outward occurrence of the otherwise.²

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has stipulated a specific time for every ruling in His Infinite Knowledge, hence when its time ends, another ruling replaces it; either order of prohibition, and thus it does not necessitate a change coming about in his Eternal Knowledge.³

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى states:

مَا نَنْسَخْ مِنْ آيَةٍ أَوْ نُنسِهَا نَأْتِ بِخَيْرٍ مِنْهَا أَوْ مِثْلَهَا

We do not abrogate a verse or cause it to be forgotten except that we bring forth [one] better than it or similar to it.⁴

‘Abd al-Qāhīr al-Baghdādī has very severely condemned the Shī‘ah for equating abrogation with Badā' and claiming that when Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى orders something and subsequently abrogates it, it is due to otherwise occurring to him.⁵

1 *Al-Washī‘ah* p. 183.

2 Muṣṭafā Zayd: *al-Naskh fī al-Qur’ān* 1/20

3 Muḥammad Abū Zuhrah: *al-Imām al-Ṣādiq* p. 241.

4 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 106.

5 *Al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* p. 52.

The Shī'ah have went headlong into this deviance, and the author of *Biḥār al-Anwār* has presented some abrogated narrations as examples of Badā'¹ despite there being no link between the two.²

Nonetheless, towards the end of his explication of Badā' Ibn Bābawayh asserts the following:

إنما هو ظهور أمر، يقول العرب بدا لي شخص في طريقي أي: ظهر. قال الله عز وجل: وَبَدَا لَهُمْ مِنَ اللَّهِ مَا لَمْ يَكُونُوا يَحْتَسِبُونَ. أي ظهر لهم ومتي ظهر لله تعالى ذكره من عبد صلة لرحمه زاد في عمره. ومتي ظهر له منه قطيعة لرحمه نقص من عمره

Badā' is not but for something to become clear. The Arabs say, '*Badā lī Shaks fi Ṭarīqī*' (a person became clear to me on the way), i.e. He appeared. Allah says, "And there will appear to them from Allah that which they had not taken into account," i.e. became clear to them. And when it becomes clear to Allah that his servant fosters family ties he increases his age, and when it becomes clear to him that he severs them he decreases his age.³

This is again repeating the very same deviant belief but after changing it and presenting it differently...

Increasing the age of the one who joins family ties has nothing to do with Badā' (or the occurrence of something to Allah which was not previously in his knowledge). But fostering family ties is a means of the elongation of life, and Allah ﷻ has decreed both lifespan and the means for increase in it. Hence, Allah ﷻ decreed that so and so will foster family ties due to which he will

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 93/83-84.

2 For more details on the differences between abrogation and Badā' see the following: Abū Ja'far al-Naḥḥās: *al-Nāsikh wa al-Mansūkh* p. 44; Abū al-Ḥusain al-Baṣārī: *al-Mu'tamad fi Uṣūl al-Fiqh* 1/368-369; Makkī al-Qaysī: *Nāsikh al-Qur'ān wa Mansūkhuh* p. 98-99; Ibn Ḥazm: *al-Iḥkām fi Uṣūl al-Aḥkām* 4/68-69; al-Āmidī: *al-Iḥkām fi Uṣūl al-Aḥkām* 3/109-112; Muḥammad Ḥamzah: *Dirāsāt al-Aḥkām wa al-Naskh fi al-Qur'ān* p. 59.

3 *al-Tawḥīd* p. 336.

achieve that end result; if it were not for that he would not have achieved this end result. He has likewise decreed that so and so will sever his family ties and thus will live for such and such amount of time.¹

On the other hand, al-Ṭūsī has opted for a rather safer way of interpreting the doctrine of *Badā'* than Ibn Bābawayh. He states:

قوله بدا لله فيه معناه بدا من الله فيه. وهكذا القول في جميع ما يروي من أنه بدا لله في إسماعيل معناه أنه بدا من الله، فإن الناس كانوا يظنون في إسماعيل بن جعفر أنه الإمام بعد أبيه، فلما مات علموا بطلان ذلك

Saying *Badā Lillah* (it occurred to Allah) actually means *Badā min Allah* (it occurred from Allah). This is the interpretation of all those narrations which state that otherwise occurred to Allah regarding Ismā'īl, i.e. otherwise occurred from Allah. For the people were thinking that Ismā'īl ibn Ja'far was going to be the Imām after his father, but when he passed away they came to realise (from Allah) that their assumption was wrong.²

This is the apologetic answer of al-Ṭūsī. It is obvious that if the occurrence of a new thought or idea happens to the creation when something unexpected happens, it does not impact the Islamic faith in any way.

One of the contemporary scholars of the Shī'ah has followed al-Ṭūsī in this explanation, and that Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā', he thus says:

البداء وإن كان جوهر معناه هو ظهور الشيء بعد خفائه، ولكن ليس المراد به هنا ظهور الشيء لله جل شأنه وأي حريجة ومسكة يقول بهذه المضلة، بل المراد ظهور الشيء من الله لمن يشاء من خلقه بعد إخفائه عنهم. وقولنا بدا لله أي بدا حكم الله أو شأن الله

Even though *Badā'* means the clarity of something after its obscurity, but here it does not mean that something becomes clear to Allah after it was

1 *Sharḥ al-Ṭahāwīyyah* p. 92.

2 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 55.

previously obscure upon him. How can any person of sound intellect and thoroughness ever say something like that? Rather it means clarity coming from Allah for whomsoever he wants in his creation after the matter having previously being obscure upon them. And when we say, “It became clear to Allah,” it means the command of Allah or the matter of Allah.¹

However, a person who studies their narrations will never find them to be harmonious with this interpretation, for they attribute Badā’ to Allah and not to the creation, which is why their Imāms refused to inform of the unseen due to the fear of Badā’ (otherwise occurring to Allah). They have attributed to Lūṭ عليه السلام that he sought the punishment hastily from the angels fearing that otherwise might occur to Allah سبحانه وتعالى, he told them:

تأخذونهم الساعة فإني أخاف أن يبدو لربي فيهم. فقالوا يا لوط إن موعدهم الصبح ليس الصبح بقريب

Punish them immediately, for I fear that otherwise will occur to my Lord regarding them, the angels said, “O Lūṭ their time is the morning, is not the morning near.”²

And in *al-Kāfī* the following narration appears:

عن أبي هشام الجعفري قال: كنت عند أبي الحسن عليه السلام بعد مضي ابنه أبي جعفر وإني أفكر في نفسي أريد أن أقول كأنهما أعني: أبا جعفر وأبا عبد الله، في هذا الوقت كأبي الحسن موسى وإسماعيل ابني جعفر بن محمد عليهم السلام، وإن قصتهما كقصتهما، إذ كان أبو محمد المرحلي بعد أبي جعفر عليه السلام فأقبل علي أبو الحسن قبل أن أنطق فقال: نعم يا أبا هاشم بدا لله في أبي محمد بعد أبي جعفر عليه السلام ما لم يكن يعرف له، كما بدا له في موسى بعد مضي إسماعيل ما كشف به عن حاله وهو كما حدثتك نفسك وإن كره المبطلون

Abū Hāshim al-Jā’farī says, “I was by Abū al-Ḥasan عليه السلام after his son Abū Ja’far passed away, I was thinking about that and wanted to say that they both, i.e. Abū Ja’far and Abū Muḥammad عليه السلام, were just like Abū al-Ḥasan

1 *Al-Dīn wa al-Islām* p. 173.

2 *Furū’ al-Kāfī* 5/546.

Mūsā and Ismā'īl the two sons of Ja'far ibn Muḥammad عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, their story is just like theirs, for Abū Muḥammad was the next candidate after Abū Ja'far عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. But before I could say anything Abū al-Ḥasan said, “Yes O Abū Hāshim! It occurred to Allah regarding Abū Muḥammad after Abū Ja'far that which he did not know about him, just as it occurred to him regarding Mūsā after the demise of Ismā'īl that which disclosed his condition. And the matter is as your heart suggests to, even if the wrongdoers dislike it.”¹

Focus on the statement, “It occurred to Allah regarding him that which he had not previously known about him,” you will find that they emphatically attribute Badā' to Allah سُبحانه وتعالى. These people therefore do not have any reverence for Allah سُبحانه وتعالى and they have used the doctrine of Badā' to keep the opportunity of choice in the Ahl al-Bayt and the recanting thereof without them being blamed by their followers. But they did not consider the Right of Allah سُبحانه وتعالى when devising this plan. This is because the fabricators of these narrations were such that their hearts were void of the fear of Allah سُبحانه وتعالى and hope in Him.

Furthermore, if Badā' was really the occurrence of a new opinion to the people from Allah then what is the reason for all this exaggeration regarding it; why is it the best of devotions and a fundamental belief. Likewise, the word Badā' linguistically bears a very bad meaning in the Arabic language in which the Qur'ān was revealed, so how can it be considered a foundational pillar of Dīn and how can there be an effort to thereafter find a 'suitable' interpretation for it.

Their Evidence for the Doctrine of Badā'

After the doctrine of Badā' attained firm grounding in the Shī'ah dogma thanks to the invented narrations of al-Kulaynī, the scholars of the Shī'ah sought evidence for it in the Book of Allah سُبحانه وتعالى. Seemingly it was not enough for them to attribute this lie to Allah سُبحانه وتعالى so they went on to claim that the Book of Allah سُبحانه وتعالى also contains it. Hence they latched onto the verse:

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/327.

يَمْحُو اللَّهُ مَا يَشَاءُ وَيُثَبِّتُ وَعِنْدَهُ أُمُّ الْكِتَابِ

Allah eliminates what He wills or confirms, and with Him is the Mother of the Book.¹

It should be noted that the first person to use this verse in substantiation of the fallacy of Badā' was Mukhtār ibn 'Ubayd al-Thaqaḥī;² he was subsequently followed by the scholars of the Shī'ah who contrived narrations attributing them to some scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt.³ Their drawing evidence from this verse is indeed erroneous and marked with stark artificiality. Because elimination and confirmation both happen with the Knowledge and the Power of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى without anything occurring to Him which He had not previously known. How can Badā' be perceived regarding him when he has the of the mother book and possesses eternal and All Encompassing Knowledge:

وَعِنْدَهُ مَفَاتِحُ الْغَيْبِ لَا يَعْلَمُهَا إِلَّا هُوَ وَيَعْلَمُ مَا فِي الْبَرِّ وَالْبَحْرِ وَمَا تَسْقُطُ مِنْ وَرَقَةٍ إِلَّا يَعْلَمُهَا وَلَا
حَبَّةٌ فِي ظُلُمَاتِ الْأَرْضِ وَلَا رَطْبٌ وَلَا يَابِسٌ إِلَّا فِي كِتَابٍ مُبِينٍ

And with Him are the keys of the unseen; none knows them except Him. And He knows what is on the land and in the sea. Not a leaf falls but that He knows it. And no grain is there within the darknesses of the earth and no moist or dry [thing] but that it is [written] in a clear record.⁴

عَالِمِ الْغَيْبِ لَا يَعْزُبُ عَنْهُ مِثْقَالُ ذَرَّةٍ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَلَا فِي الْأَرْضِ وَلَا أَصْغَرُ مِنْ ذَلِكَ وَلَا أَكْبَرُ
إِلَّا فِي كِتَابٍ مُبِينٍ

Not absent from Him is an atom's weigh within the heavens or within the earth or [what is] smaller than that or greater, except that it is in a clear register.⁵

1 Sūrah al-Ra'd: 39.

2 See p. 1255 of this book.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/146; Ibn Bābawayh: *al-Tawhīd* p. 333, onwards.

4 Sūrah al-An'ām: 59.

5 Sūrah Saba': 3.

There are many other verses of this sort. Affirming Badā' for Allah ﷻ tends to belie all these verses.¹ Allah ﷻ states at the end of the verse that all elimination and confirmation happen with His will and are recorded in the Mother Book.²

1 See: al-Ghazālī: *al-Mustaṣfā* 1/110; *Mukhtaṣar al-Ṣawāqī* 1/110; al-Āmidī: *al-Iḥkām* 3/111.

The exegetes have differed as to the meaning of elimination and confirmation and there are eight opinions in that regard (see: Ibn al-Jawzī: *Zād al-Masīr* 4/337-338). Some aver that Allah eliminates rulings of Sharī'ah by abrogating them, and he confirms others, both based on His will. The commentator of al-Ṭaḥāwīyyah avers that this meaning is harmonious with the context (*Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwīyyah* p. 94). Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī says, "The most preferred interpretation of the verse is that Allah ﷻ threatened the polytheists who ask Rasūl Allah ﷺ for miracles with his punishment and told them:

وَمَا كَانَ لِرَسُولٍ أَنْ يَأْتِيَ بِآيَةٍ إِلَّا بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ لِكُلِّ أَجَلٍ كِتَابٌ

It is not possible for a messenger to bring a miracle but with the permission of Allah, for every time there is a record. (Al-Ra'd: 38)

Thereby informing them that there is a set time for Allah's decree regarding them, till which they will be given respite, he then tells them that when that time arrives Allah will eliminate those whose death is imminent and whose sustenance has seized. Simultaneously he will confirm or keep those who still have time and sustenance in this world (see: *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 13/170).

Others have given preference to the generalisation of the elimination and confirmation to everything (see: *Faṭḥ al-Qadīr* 3/88).

However, Ibn Juzay objected to those who generalise the verse and says that it is debunked by the established principle that the decree of Allah does not change, nor does his knowledge (see: *al-Tashīl* 2/136.)

Al-Shawkānī responding to this says that generalising the verse is not against that principle due to elimination and confirmation also being part of what Allah has decreed (see: *Faṭḥ al-Qadīr* 3/88).

And al-Qasimī has interpreted the word Āyāt to mean miracles (see: *Tafsīr al-Qasimī* 13/372-373). Also refer to *Tafsīr al-Baghawī* 3/22-23; *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 2/559-561; *Tafsīr al-Ālūsī* 13/169-172; al-Sa'dī *Taysīr al-Karīm al-Raḥmān* 4/116-117.

These are some of the interpretations of the Muslims in this regard; none of them said anything like that of the blasphemous interpretation of the Shī'ah.

2 'Abd al-Razzāq 'Afīfī: commentary of Āmidī's *al-Iḥkām* 3/111.

Narrations in the Books of the Twelvers which Refute the Doctrine of Badā'

Debunking the argument of the opponent with his own assertions is the strongest form of debunking, because he destroys himself with his own weapon and the existence of contradiction in his assertions is a sign of them being invalid. Hence you will find many narrations in the books of the Shī'ah wherein the Imāms are reported to have cursed those who believe in Badā' with disgrace. These narrations contradict the narrations that have passed previously.

It is very possible that these narrations are authentically linked to the scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt due to them revealing the reality which is congruous with these erudite people. And they probably are the remains of the moderate Shī'ah which left their mark in the books of the Twelvers. Likewise it is not improbable that the heretics who invented the narrations of Badā' contrived these narrations as a cover up for their doctrine of Badā'.

Be it as it may, citing these narrations will show the extent of contradiction which is found in the narrations of this cult and will illustrate that it is based upon anomalous views which are in complete contrast with the majority and their tradition. Because according to them what opposes the majority entails good and guidance, as has always been the motto of the heretics, in such a way that it takes a person out of the fold of Islam.

The following narration appears in *al-Tawhīd* of Ibn Bābawayh:

عن منصور بن حازم قال: سألت أبا عبد الله عليه السلام هل يكون اليوم شيء لم يكن في علم الله تعالى بالأمس؟ قال: لا، من قال هذا فأخزاه الله، قلت: أ رأيت ما كان وما هو كائن إلي يوم القيامة أليس في علم الله قال: بلي، قبل أن يخلق الخلق.

Manṣūr ibn Ḥāzim mentions, "I asked Abū 'Abd Allāh عليه السلام, 'Can anything which was not in the Knowledge of Allah yesterday happen today?'"

He said, "No. May Allah disgrace whoever says that."

I thus said, “Is it not that whatever happened and whatever is to happen till the Day of Judgement in the knowledge of Allah?”

He said, “Indeed. Allah had prior knowledge of everything even before creating the creation.”¹

There is no doubt that the doctrine of Badā’ in terms of its literal meaning, in light of the narrations of the Twelvers, and in light of the interpretation of their scholars; suggests that what Allah had no knowledge of yesterday might occur to Him today.

It is indeed a very grave indictment for the Shī’ah that they exonerate their Imāms of such a flaw but attribute it to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. Hence when the foretelling of the Imām does not materialise they exonerate the Imām but they attribute the flaw thereof to Allah. And if you study their beliefs regarding the Oneness of Allah in terms of Him being the deity and the nourisher and His Oneness in His Names and Qualities, you will find that they have given their Imāms the position of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى in their hearts and minds, all because of the influence of those infectious narrations with which their books are replete. The doctrine of Badā’ is likewise the aftermath of their exaggeration regarding the Imāms.

1 *al-Tawhīd* p. 334; *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/148. See another narration with a similar meaning in *al-Kāfī* 1/148.

Chapter Eight

The Doctrine of *Ṭinah*

This is one of their secretive beliefs regarding which they emphasise that it should be kept a secret even from their laymen. Because if a lay Shī'ī comes to learn of it he will intentionally commit major sins in order to acquire the temporary pleasures of this world due to him knowing that the evil consequences of those sins will be on others besides him on the Day of Judgment.¹

This doctrine was considered reprehensible by some of the early erudite Shī'ah like al-Murtaḍā and Ibn Idrīs, because according to them although the narrations thereof frequently feature in the books of the Shī'ah, but due to them being transmissions of single narrators which oppose the Qur'ān, the Sunnah, and the unanimity of the Ummah it is compulsory to discard it.²

Nonetheless, these narrations increased with the passage of time, to the extent that their scholar Ni'mat Allāh al-Jazā'irī (d. 1112) states the following:

إن أصحابنا قد رووا هذه الأخبار بالأسانيد المتكثرة في الأصول وغيرها، فلم يبق مجال في إنكارها
والحكم عليها بأنها أخبار آحاد. بل صارت مستفيضة مشهورة

Our scholars have narrated these narrations with copious transmissions in the canonical works and other works, hence there is no room for denying them and averring that they are transmissions of single narrators. Rather they have now become wide-spread and undeniably authentic.³

He said this in refuting the two aforementioned scholars who refused to acknowledge it.

1 *Al-Anwār al-Nu'māniyyah* 1/295.

2 *Ibid.* 1/293.

3 *Ibid.*

Again, the person who ostensibly was responsible for founding this doctrine and according to its firm grounding was their scholar al-Kulaynī who established a chapter by the title, *Chapter regarding the Ṭīnah of a believer and a disbeliever*, wherein he cites seven narrations.¹

Subsequently these narrations continued to increase, so much so that their scholar al-Majlisī documented sixty seven narrations in the chapter he established by the title, *The Ṭīnah and the pledge*.²

Probably the reader would be intrigued to learn the details of this doctrine which makes a Shīʿī believe that whatever sin he will commit the evil consequences thereof will be upon the Ahl al-Sunnah. And conversely, whatever good the Ahl al-Sunnah will carry out will be preserved for the Shīʿah. It is owing to this that their scholars do not divulge it to their commonality so that they do not go about causing havoc on the land and in the lives of people.

The most detailed narration regarding this doctrine appears in '*Ilal al-Sharāʿi*' of Ibn Bābawayh which cover five pages and upon which he terminates his book.³ Commenting on the status of this narration one of their contemporary scholars comments that it is a musky ending with which he has ended his book, '*Ilal al-Sharāʿi*'.⁴

The crux of the narration is that a Shīʿah has been created from a specific type of soil and a Sunnī has been created from a specific type of soil, and both the soils were mixed in a very unique way. Hence all the sins which are found in a Shīʿī are due to the influence of the Sunnī soil and all the good that is found in a Sunnī is owing to the influence of the Shīʿī soil. As a result, on the Day of Judgment all the evils and vices of the Shīʿah will be placed upon the Ahl al-Sunnah and all the good of the Ahl al-Sunnah will be granted to the Shīʿah.

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/2-6.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 5/2255-276.

3 '*Ilal al-Sharāʿi*' p. 606-610.

4 *Bihār al-Anwār* 5: 233: footnotes.

More than seventy of their narrations revolve around the same theme.

The reason for the invention of this doctrine can be ascertained from the questions which were being posed to the Imāms and the complaints which were being raised to them. The Shī'ah would complain of the indulgence of their people in major sins, disastrous actions, ill treatment of one another, and the depression that they were suffering from; but the cause of which they could not identify. And the Imām responds to all of that by saying that they are because of the Shī'ī soil being effected by the Sunnī soil.

Let us have a look at some of these interesting questions which reveal the reality of the Shī'ī society back then. Ibn Bābawayh has written the following with his chain of transmission:

عن أبي إسحاق الليثي قال: قلت لأبي جعفر محمد بن علي الباقر عليه السلام: يا ابن رسول الله أخبرني عن المؤمن المستبصر إذا بلغ في المعرفة وكمل هل يزني؟ قال: اللهم لا. قلت: فيشرب الخمر؟ قال: لا. قلت: فيأتي بكبيرة من هذه الكبائر أو فاحشة من هذه الفواحش؟ قال: لا... قلت: يا ابن رسول الله إني أجد من شبتكم من يشرب الخمر ويقطع الطريق ويخيف السبيل ويزني ويلوط ويأكل الربو ويرتكب الفواحش ويتهاون بالصلاة والصيام والزكاة ويقطع الرحم ويأتي الكبائر. فكيف هذا ولم ذاك؟ فقال: يا إبراهيم هل يختلج في صدرك شيء غير هذا؟ قلت: نعم يا ابن رسول الله، وأجد من أعدائكم و مناصبيكم من يكثر من الصلاة والصيام ويخرج الزكاة ويتابع بين الحج والعمرة ويحرص علي الجهاد ويأثر -كذا- علي البر وعلي صلة الرحم ويقضي حقوق إخوانه ويواسيهم من ماله ويتجنب شرب الخمر والزنا واللواط وسائر الفواحش فما ذاك ولم ذاك؟ فسر له لي يا ابن رسول الله وبرهنة وبينه، فقد والله كثر فكري وأسهر ليلي وضاق ذرعِي

Abū Ishāq al-Laythī says: I asked Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn 'Alī al-Bāqir عليه السلام the following, "O son of Rasūl Allah! Tell me regarding an insightful believer who reaches the pinnacle of recognition and is perfect, is it permissible for him to fornicate?"

He said, "By Allah, no."

I asked, "Can he consume wine?"

He said, "No."

I further asked, “Can he commit any of the major sins or any obscene act?”

He again said, “No.”

I then said, “O son of Rasūl Allah! I see some of your partisans consuming wine, highway robbing, endangering the roads, fornicating, sodomising, eating usury, committing obscene acts, being lax in ṣalāh, fasting, and discharging zakāh, severing family ties and indulging in major sins. So can this be possible and why?”

He said, “O Ibrāhīm! Is anything else besides this troubling you also?”

I said, “Yes, O son of Rasūl Allah, a problem even graver than this.”

He asked, “What is that O Abū Ishāq?”

I said, “And I see among your enemies and your haters people who perform ṣalāh, fast, and discharge zakāh excessively, who follow their Ḥajj up with ‘Umrah, who are desirous to strive in Jihād, who give preference in matters of good, join family ties, fulfil the right of the brothers and sympathise with them with their wealth, and who refrain from consuming wine, fornicating, sodomy, and all other obscene crimes. Why is that? Explain to me, O son of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, provide evidence for me and tell me. For by Allah my thoughts have increased, my nights are sleepless, and I feel very restless.”¹

This is but one query which reveals the perturbation of the Shī‘ah regarding their sad reality which was filled with sins and destructive crimes in comparison to the pious predecessors of this Ummah, the Imāms of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and the majority of the commonality who were on piety, trustworthiness, and good. The answer given to this query was in line with the doctrine of Ṭīnah, i.e. the sins which are found in the Shī‘ah are the result of the ill-effect of the soil of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the virtue which prevails in the Sunnī society is the result of the good-effect of the soil of the Shī‘ah.

1 *‘Ilal al-Sharā’i* p. 606-607; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 5/228-229.

Another inquirer by the name Ishāq al-Qummī comes and says to Abū Ja'far al-Bāqir:

جعلت فداك أرى المؤمن الموحد الذي يقول بقولي ويدين الله بولايتكم وليس بيني وبينه خلاف، يشرب السكر ويزني ويلوط آتية في حاجة واحدة فأصيبه معبس الوجه كالح اللون ثقيلًا في حاجتي بطيئًا فيها. وقد أرى الناصب المخالف لما أنا عليه ويعرفني بذلك فآتية في حاجة فأصيبه طلق الوجه حسن البشر متسرعا في حاجتي فرحًا بها يحب قضاءها كثير الصلاة كثير الصيام كثير الصدقة يؤدي الزكاة ويستودع فيؤدي الأمانة

May be sacrificed for you, I see a believer who affirms the oneness of Allah, believes in what I believe, considers your Imāmah to be an act of devotion to seek proximity to Allah and between him and I there is no difference, I see this person drinking wine, fornicating and sodomising, and when I come to him for a need I find him to be frowning, dull, reluctant to help me and slow. And at times I see a hater and an opponent who goes against me in my beliefs and knows me for who I am,¹ I come to him for a need and I find him to be smiling congenial and quick to fulfil my need; he loves fulfilling my need, performs ṣalāh, fasts, and gives charity excessively. He discharges his zakāh and is trustworthy when entrusted with a trust.²

This person adds a new dimension to his complaint, i.e. the bad interaction of his companions, their callous nature, and their lack of loyalty; whilst on the other hand he finds the Ahl al-Sunnah—his enemies—to be better to him than his companions, more willing to fulfil his needs, and better in character, interaction, and devotion.

Similar to this is the complaint the Shī'ah raised to Abū 'Abd Allāh. It reads as follows:

أرى الرجل من أصحابنا ممن يقول بقولنا خبيث اللسان خبيث الخلطة قليل الوفاء بالميعاد فيغمني غما شديداً، وأرى الرجل من المخالفين علينا حسن السميت حسن الهدى وفيا بالميعاد فأغتم غما

1 i.e. that I am a Shī'ī.

2 'Ilal al-Sharā'i' p. 489-490; Biḥār al-Anwār 5/236-237.

I see a person from our companions, who says what we say, to be bad-mouthed, poor in his companionship and disloyal in his promises, and that hurts me a lot. And I see a person from our opponents to be good in his manners, good in his ways, and loyal in his promises, and that also causes me to grieve.¹

A fourth inquirer comes and he complains of the depression and grief which he is experiencing without knowing the cause of it. Their narration states:

عن أبي بصير قال: دخلت علي أبي عبد الله ومعني رجل من أصحابنا فقلت له: جعلت فداك يا ابن رسول الله، إني أغتم وأحزن من غير أن أعرف لذلك سببا

Abū Baṣīr says, “I went to Abū ‘Abd Allāh and with me was a person from my friends. I thus said to him, ‘O son of Rasūl Allah! I feel depressed and grieved and I do not know the reason thereof...’”²

Seemingly the cause for his grief was the obscure dogma which he adhered to and which all the Shī‘ah lived by, but the Imām again explains this in light of the doctrine of Ṭīnah.

There are many questions and complaints of this type.³ They give us an idea of the Shī‘ah make up in its temperament, connections, character, dealings, and religion. The scholars of the Shī‘ah tried to counter this complexity from which some truthful Shī‘ah were suffering due to these disturbing and threatening phenomena and their efforts thus eventually lead them to answering these persistent questions and complaints with the doctrine of Ṭīnah. Let us, therefore, have a look at some of the answers given to these questions.⁴ Their Imāms are reported to have said:

1 Al-Barqī: *al-Maḥāsīn* p. 137-138; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 5/251.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 5/242, he attributes the narration to ‘*Ilal al-Sharā‘i*’ p. 42.

3 You will find them under the chapter of Ṭīnah in *al-Kāfī* and *Biḥār al-Anwār*. Some more examples will be coming in the chapter regarding the influence of the Shī‘ah upon the Muslim world.

4 The answer cited below was given, as they allege, to the question of Ishāq al-Qummī which has passed on page no. 1277 of this book. Due to fear of elongating the discussion I will suffice on the previously cited references, because they all ultimately prove the same phenomenon...

يا إسحاق إن الله عزوجل لما كان منفردا بالوحدانية ابتدأ الأشياء لا من شيء، فأجري الماء العذب علي أرض طيبة طاهرة سبعة أيام مع لياليها، ثم نضب الماء عنها فقبض قبضة من صفاوة ذلك الطين وهي طينتنا أهل البيت، ثم قبض قبضة من أسفل من ذلك الطين وهي طينة شيعتنا، ثم اصطفانا لنفسه. فلو أن طينة شيعتنا تركت كما تركت طينتنا لما زني أحد منهم وسرق ولا لاط ولا شرب المسكر ولا اكتسب شيئا مما ذكرت. ولكن الله عزوجل أجرى الماء المالح علي أرض ملعونة سبعة أيام ولياليها ثم نضب الماء عنها، ثم قبض قبضته، وهي طينة ملعونة من حمأ مسنون، وهي طينة خبال، وهي طينة أعدائنا. فلو أن الله عزوجل ترك طينتهم كما أخذها لم تروهم في خلق الأدميين ولم يقرأوا بالشهادتين ولم يصوموا ولم يصلوا ولم يزكوا ولم يحجوا البيت ولم تروا أحدا منهم بحسن خلق، ولكن الله تبارك وتعالى جمع الطيبتين طينتك وطينتهم فخلطهما وعركهما عرك الأديم ومزجهما بالمائتين. فما رأيت من أخيك من شر لفظ أو زنا أو شيء مما ذكرت من شرب مسكر أو غيره ليس من جوهريته وليس من إيمانه، إنما هو بمسحة الناصب اجترح هذه السيئات التي ذكرت. وما رأيت من الناصب من حسن وجه وحسن خلق أو صوم أو صلاة أو حج بيت أو صدقة أو معروف فليس من جوهريته إنما تلك الأفاعيل من مسحة الإيمان اكتسبها وهو اكتساب مسحة الإيمان

قلت: جعلت فداك، فإذا كان يوم القيامة فمه؟ قال لي: يا إسحق أجمع الله الخير والشر في موضع واحد؟ إذا كان يوم القيامة نزع الله عزوجل مسحة الإيمان منهم فردها إلي شيعتنا، ونزع مسحة الناصب بجميع ما اكتسبوا من السيئات فردها علي أعدائنا وعاد كل شيء إلي عنصره الأول.

قلت: جعلت فداك تؤخذ من حسناتهم فترد إلينا وتؤخذ من سيئاتنا فترد إليهم؟ قال: إي والله الذي لا إله إلا هو.

“O Ishāq (the narrator of the report) Do you know from where you were brought into existence?”

I said, “May I be sacrificed for you, certainly not, unless you tell me.”

He thus said, “O Ishāq, when Allah ﷻ was alone He created everything from nothing, He then made sweet water flow upon a pure and fertile land for seven days and nights where after the water became dry. He then took a handful of the choicest soil thereof, which is our soil, the soil of the Ahl al-Bayt. He then took a handful of soil from beneath that soil, which is the soil of our partisans. He then chose us for himself. So if the soil of our Shī'ah was left just as our soil was left no one among them would sin, steal, sodomise, consume wine, or do any of the sins you mentioned. But Allah ﷻ made saline water flow upon an accursed land for seven days and nights where after the water dried up. He then took a handful of soil which was accursed

and was made of black smelly sand, i.e. it was the sand of defilement, this was the sand of our enemies. If Allah ﷻ left their soil as he had taken it you would not have seen the traits of men in them, nor would they have professed the Shahādātān, fasted, performed ṣalāh, discharged zakāh, went for Ḥajj, and nor would you have seen anyone of them with good conduct. However, Allah ﷻ mixed both the soils (your soil and their soil), he mixed them and scrubbed them just as a skin is scrubbed and thereafter mixed them with the two waters. Hence whatever evil you see in your brother, i.e. being bad mouthed, fornicating and whatever else like drinking and the rest that you made mention of, they are not inherently from him and are not part of his faith, rather he committed these wrongs because of the influence of the haters. All the good that you see in a hater in terms of his conduct, his congeniality, fasting, performing ṣalāh, going for Ḥajj, giving charity and doing good, they are also not inherently from him, rather he does all of this because of the influence of īmān which he acquired.”

I further asked, “So when the Day of Judgment comes then what?”

He said, “O Ishāq can Allah ﷻ combine good and evil in one place? When the Day of Judgement will come Allah will remove the influence of īmān from them and give it to our partisans and he will likewise remove the evil influence of the haters with all the evil that they (the Shī'ah) did and return them to our enemies and everything will return to its origins.”

I then asked, “Will their good be taken and returned to us? And will our evil be taken and returned to them?”

He said, “Yes By the one besides who there is no one who is worthy of worship.”¹

This is the doctrine of Ṭīnah, in the narration of al-Qummī the following appears in the beginning:

1 *‘Ilal al-Sharā’i’* p. 490-491; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 5/247-248.

خذ إليك بيانا شافيا فيما سألت، وعلمنا مكنونا من خزان علم الله وسره

Pay attention to a satisfying answer for your query and a hidden treasure of knowledge from the Knowledge of Allah and His secrets.¹

And the end of the narration states:

خذها إليك يا أبا إسحاق، فوالله إنه لمن غرر أحاديثنا وباطن سرايرنا ومكنون خزانتنا وانصرف ولا تطلع علي سرنا أحدا إلا مؤمنا مستبصرا. فإنك إن أذعت سرنا بليت في نفسك ومالك وأهلك وولدك

Take this, O Abū Ishāq, for it is from our illuminating narrations, our innermost secrets and our hidden treasures. Go and do not tell anybody besides an insightful believer of our secret. If you divulge our secret you will be tested in yourself, your wealth, your wife, and children.²

As you can see, this was one of their secret beliefs which has been circulated in the wake of the mighty Islamic empire; the secrecy thereof is emphasised in the beginning and the end. So did the mere thought of this doctrine falling in the hands of the Ahl al-Sunnah who will announce it before the people as one of the flaws of the Shī'ah even cross the mind of the inventor thereof?

Analysing the Doctrine of Ṭīnah

Firstly, these narrations are self-contradictory, because the Shī'ī, as you have noticed in these complains and questions, is more immersed in crime, much more indulgent in sins and destructive actions, worse in his dealings, and pathetic in his religion and conduct. So how can such a person be better in terms of his origins and purer in his creation?

Secondly, Allah ﷻ has created everybody upon the disposition of Islam. Allah ﷻ says:

1 'Ilal al-Sharā'i' p. 607; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 5/229.

2 'Ilal al-Sharā'i' p. 610; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 5/233.

فَأَقِمْ وَجْهَكَ لِلدِّينِ حَنِيفًا فِطْرَتَ اللَّهِ الَّتِي فَطَرَ النَّاسَ عَلَيْهَا لَا تَبْدِيلَ لِخَلْقِ اللَّهِ ذَلِكَ الدِّينُ الْقَيُّمُ

So direct your face [i.e., self] toward the religion, inclining to truth. [Adhere to] the Fīṭrah of Allah upon which He has created [all] people. No change should there be in the creation of Allah. That is the correct religion.¹

Separating men and sound disposition is something unique to Shī'ism.

Thirdly, the Shī'ah have contradicted their stance on the actions of men due to believing in the reports of Ṭīnah, for the purport of these narrations suggest that man is forced to do what he does without him having any choice, i.e. he does everything because of his Ṭīnah. Whereas their stance is that every person creates his own actions as is the stance of the Mu'tazilah.²

Fourthly, this belief entails that all the evil of the Shī'ah will be placed upon the shoulders of the Ahl al-Sunnah and all the good of the Muslims will be given to the Shī'ah. This is against the divine justice of Allah ﷻ and is not harmonious with clear reason and sound human disposition, let alone it being harmonious with the authoritative texts of the Sharī'ah and the fundamentals of Islam. Allah ﷻ says:

وَلَا تَزِرُ وَازِرَةٌ وِزْرَ أُخْرَىٰ

No soul will carry the burden of another.³

Likewise:

كُلُّ نَفْسٍ بِمَا كَسَبَتْ رَهِيْنَةٌ

1 Sūrah al-Rūm: 30.

2 See p. 870 of this book.

3 Sūrah al-Fāṭir: 18.

Every soul will be held back for what it earned.¹

Likewise:

فَمَنْ يَعْمَلْ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ خَيْرًا يَرَهُ وَمَنْ يَعْمَلْ مِثْقَالَ ذَرَّةٍ شَرًّا يَرَهُ

Whoever does an iota of good will see it and whoever does an iota of bad will see it.²

Likewise:

الْيَوْمَ تُجْزَى كُلُّ نَفْسٍ بِمَا كَسَبَتْ لَا ظُلْمَ الْيَوْمَ

Today every soul will be rewarded for what it earned. There will be no oppression today.³

The invalidity of this doctrine is unquestionable, the falsity thereof becomes clear from merely thinking of it; it is indeed an indictment to the Twelver dogma and a disgrace to it.

The Shī'ah to date do not hesitate in openly proclaiming this doctrine, hence you will find that a contemporary Shī'ī scholar whilst commenting on the narrations of *Biḥār al-Anwār* and *al-Anwār al-Nu'māniyyah* in this regard makes remarks which smack of his approval and approbation for it.

And if you have no modesty then do as you wish.

1 Sūrah al-Muddaththir: 38.

2 Sūrah al-Zilzāl: 7, 8.

3 Sūrah al-Mu'min: 17.

Section Four

The Contemporary Shī'ah and Their Link with Their Predecessors

Introduction:

In this chapter I shall, with the permission of Allah ﷻ, discuss the creed of the contemporary Twelver Scholars. You will thus not find herein anything besides their views, yes with the exception of a few ancient views which will be quoted when handling a specific topic. What I mean by 'contemporary' is the scholars of the previous century, the last hundred years.

I shall elaborate the extent to which they are in agreement with their classical sources wherein those very problematic issues, some of which have passed, occur.

I shall also expound upon the type of relationship they maintain with the ancient Shī'ī sects, i.e. a relationship of acceptance and agreement or one of disdain and rejection.

Thereafter, I shall present some of their views regarding some doctrinal issues in order to ascertain as to whether the Twelver Shī'ism of today is any different from that of the past.

And finally I shall shed light upon the country of the Ayatollah and the reality of Shī'ism which can be understood therefrom.

Chapter one

Relationship in the sources of *Talaqqī* (acquisition)

Subscription to the same sources of acquiring and learning is the first and the last cause of uniformity in ideologies and views according to any sect or denomination, and it is these sources that link the later generations with the earlier ones.

The contemporary Shī'ah have relied upon their four early canonical works in acquiring their creed, i.e. *al-Kāfī*, *al-Tahdhīb*, *al-Istibṣār* and *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh*. This is affirmed by many of their scholars, some among them being Āghā Buzruk al-Ṭahrānī in his book *al-Dharī'ah*,¹ Muḥsin al-Amīn in *A'yān al-Shī'ah*² and others.³

‘Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Mūsawī, their senior scholar and leading cleric in contemporary times, states the following regarding their four books:

وهي الكافي والتهديب والإستبصار ومن لا يحضره الفقيه، وهي متواترة، ومضامينها مقطوع بصحتها،
والكافي أقدمها وأعظمها وأحسنها وأتقنها

They are *al-Kāfī*, *al-Tahdhīb*, *al-Istibṣār* and *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh*. They are widely transmitted and their content is categorically established. From amongst them *al-Kāfī* is the oldest, the greatest, the best, and the most outstanding.⁴

Having said this, the question is: Are the contemporaries any different from al-Kulaynī and his likes, especially when they all subscribe and have recourse to the same set of canonical works? Naturally they can never be different, especially in the fundamentals and politics.

The matter, however, does not stop there...

1 *Al-Dharī'ah* 17/245.

2 *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1/280.

3 See for example the introduction of *Safīnah al-Biḥār*.

4 *Al-Murāja'āt* p. 311.

Rather their contemporary scholars have accorded what their scholars of the twelfth and the thirteenth century have compiled, the last of who was al-Nūrī (d. 1320 A.H.) in his book *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il*, canonical status and have classed them 'the four later books'. Notwithstanding that in doing so they have placed their reliance in narrations which were documented only in the belated fourteenth century from the Imāms who lived in the first centuries of Islam.

Furthermore, these books, with the exception of *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il*, were all compiled in the era of the Safawids. They thus comprise of such extremist and exaggerative tendencies that did not even cross the minds of the earlier Shī'ah, as you will find in the *Biḥār* of al-Majlisī. And in spite of that these books have earned acclaim in the ranks of the contemporary scholars which implies that a very grave development has taken place in contemporary Shī'ism which has pushed them further into the abysses of misguidance and radicalism.

And that is not all, rather the contemporary Shī'ah have placed their reliance in tens of books which allegedly link them to their predecessors and have considered them equal in rank to the four early canonical works in terms of substantiation and derivation of law. This is explicitly clear in the introductions written to these books. Following al-Majlisī who has accorded these books the status of canonicity they have adopted the same approach to them.

Surprisingly, even some of the books of the Ismā'īliyyah have been given the status of classical books by the contemporary Shī'ah clergy, as in the case of *Da'ā'im al-Islām* of al-Nu'mān ibn Muḥammad ibn Manṣūr (d. 363 A.H.) who is recorded as an Ismā'īlī in some of the books of the Twelvers themselves.¹ Despite this, their senior scholars have recourse to it.²

1 The Twelver Shī' Ibn Shar Āshūb (d. 588 A.H.) states, "The Judge al-Nu'mān ibn Muḥammad is not an Imāmī." (*Ma'ālim al-'Ulamā'* p. 139). As you have previously learnt, the Twelvers class those who do not believe any of their Imāms as one who rejected the prophethood of one of the prophets, i.e. a disbeliever. And the Ismā'īlīs reject the Imāmāh of all the Imāms after Ja'far al-Ṣādiq, despite that the Twelvers still have recourse to their books which implicitly implies that they receive their knowledge from infidels.

2 Khomeini for example refers to him in his book *al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 68.

In fact, some of the contemporary scholars of the Shī'ah go on to assert that there is uniformity in the classical texts of the Ismā'īliyyah and the Twelvers. Hence one of them says:

وإذا لم يكن الفاطميون علي المذهب الإثني عشري فإن هذا المذهب قد اشتد أزره ووجد منطلقا في عهدهم، فقد عظم نفوذه ونشط دعائه... ذلك أن الإثني عشرية والإسماعيلية وإن اختلفوا من جهات، فإنهم يلتقون في هذه الشعائر بخاصة في تدريس علوم آل البيت والتفقه بها وحمل الناس عليها

Even though the Fatimids were not Twelvers, the Twelver creed definitely gained prominence and progressed in their era, for its infiltration increased and its propagators became more active. This is because, even though the Twelvers and the Ismā'īliyyah differ in many ways, they converge upon these symbols, more specifically teaching the knowledge of the Ahl al-Bayt, gaining an in depth understanding of it and persuading the people to practice upon it.¹

And in *Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-Islāmiyyah* the following appears regarding the opening that the extremist found to the Twelver dogma:

علي أن الحدود لم تغفل تماما إمام الغلاة يدل علي ذلك التقدير الذي دام طويلا للكتاب الأكبر للإسماعيلية وهو كتاب دعائم الإسلام

Not forgetting that the doors did not completely close upon the extremists. The evidence for this is the veneration which the most crucial book of the Ismā'īliyyah named *Da'ā'im al-Islām* enjoyed for a very long time²

This is a fact, for whoever will study some of the books of the Ismā'īliyyah will find many similarities between the two denominations.³

1 Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah: *al-Shī'ah fī al-Mīzān* p. 163

2 *Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-Islāmiyyah* 14/72.

3 One such similarity is their report: "He who does not believe in our return is not from amongst us." This appears in the books of the Ismā'īliyyah (see p. 67 under the discussion of the four books of the Ismā'īliyyah) just as it appears in the books of the Twelvers (see p. 57).

All of this implies that the Twelver sect has placed itself in a deep ocean of darkness by choosing to accord canonical status to all those books which have reached them from the people of the bygone eras...

We find that in these times there has come about a movement which is calling for the revival of the ancient scriptural Shī' legacy and for popularising it among the masses. This legacy is replete with criticisms of the Book of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. It is likewise replete with the curses, excommunication and tails of the everlasting damnation of the people of the first century of Islam, at the forefront of who are the three Khulafā', some of the Mothers of the Believers, and the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār who were pleased with Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and with who Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى was pleased, as is established in the Qur'ān.

This movement was initiated by the most prominent Mujtahidīn of the Shī'ah in this era, and they have revised, annotated many of these books and even written prefaces upon them. And in spite of all of that we do not find any of them disavowing or condemning the appalling disbelief and heresy that appears in these books. Is this not approval from their side for whatever features in them?

Furthermore, professor 'Alī al-Sālūs posed a question to one of the contemporary scholars of the Shī'ah inquiring about his view regarding the preposterous and hyperbolic narrations which appear in *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*. He replied with the following which is his letter verbatim:

أما الروايات التي ذكرها شيخنا الكليني في كتابه الكافي فهي موثوقة الصدور عندنا... وما ورد في الكافي أن الأئمة يعلمون جميع العلوم التي خرجت إلي الملائكة والأنبياء والرسل وإنهم إذا شأوا أن يعلموا علموا، ويعلمون متى يموتون ولا يموتون إلا باختيار منهم، ويعلمون علم ما كان وما يكون ولا يخفي عليهم شيء، ولا شك أنهم أولياء الله الذين أخلصوا له في الطاعة. ثم ذكر قولاً من أئمتهم وهو: قولوا فينا ما شئتم ونزهونا عن الربوبية.

As for the narrations which our scholar al-Kulaynī has documented in his book *al-Kāfī* they are authentic according to us. And all those narrations in

al-Kāfī which talk of the Imāms possessing all types of knowledge which was dispensed to the angels, the Prophets and Messengers, of them having the ability to know when they intended to know, of them having knowledge of when they are going to die and that they do not die but when they want to, of them having knowledge of the past and the future and of nothing being hidden from them (are true), for verily they were the friends of Allah who were sincere in his worship.” (He then cites a quotation of their Imāms which reads as,) “Say regarding us what you want, but do not deify us.”¹

This does not require any explanation, for he has affirmed for his Imāms such attributes which are only suited to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. And this is not just the view of al-Kifā’ī alone regarding the exaggerated content of *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*, rather al-Khunayzī who has written a book in which he calls for Sunnī Shī’ah unity also treats these very issues in a way that is no different than that of al-Kifā’ī.² Keeping in mind that this book was written under the guise of *Taḥiyyah* (dissimulation) in order to call towards the alleged unity which they claim exists between the Ahl al-Sunnah and them and which they have used as a deceptive missionary tool in order to beguile the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Likewise, another scholar of theirs who goes by the name Luṭf Allāh al-Ṣāfī responded to Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb, who cited some of the exaggerations suggested by the headings of some of the chapters in *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*, with the following:

أن الأبواب المعنونة ليست إلا عناوين لبعض ما ورثوا عن جدتهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

These are but a reflection of some of the knowledge they inherited from their grandfather Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.³

1 Correspondence with al-Kāzīm al-Kifā’ī, the original copy published by ‘Alī al-Sālūs in *Fiqh al-Shī’ah* p. 265).

2 Abū al-Ḥasan al-Khunayzī: *al-Da’wah al-Islāmiyyah* 1/27-28

3 *Al-Khuṭūṭ al-‘Arīḍah* p. 149.

Read what one of their clerics has to say regarding what their Imāms have left for their followers as evidence of their Imāmāh:

إن لهم آثارا تدل علي تلك الإمامة المقصودة، ولا أريد أن أدلك علي مجاميع عديدة رويت عنهم وألفت في عصورهم أو ما قاربها... أمثال تحف العقول وبصائر الدرجات والخرائج والجرائح واحتجاج الطبرسي والخصال والتوحيد للصدوق... إلي ما يكثر تعداده. بل إنما أريد أن أدلك علي أثر واحد جامع، وفيه القدر المعلي لكل إمام، إلا وهو أصول الكافي لثقة الإسلام محمد بن يعقوب الكليني... وقد ألف هذا الكتاب النفيس في عشرين عاما وأثبت فيه لكل إمام في كتبه وأبوابه من الأحاديث ما ينبئك علي أن ذلك الفرات الساتع يمتد من ينبوع الفيض الإلهي، وإن الناس فارغة الحقائق عن مثل تلك النفائس

They have signs which establish the desired position of Imāmāh, I do not want guide to you to great books which have been reported from them and compiled in their eras. The likes of *Tuḥaf al-‘Uqūl*, *Baṣā’ir al-Darajāt*, *al-Kharā’ij wa al-Jarā’ih*, *al-Iḥtijāj* of al-Ṭabarsī, *al-Tawḥīd* of al-Ṣadūq, etc., rather I would just like to guide you to one among them, a book which is the principle work of every Imām (literally translated as the chief arrow among the divining arrows). And that is *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* of the reliable transmitter of Islam Muḥammad ibn Ya’qūb al-Kulaynī. He compiled this magnum opus in a period of twenty years and he has included the narrations of every Imām in the chapters and sub-chapters thereof. This is sufficient to inform you that this immense knowledge extends from the inundating Knowledge of Allah ﷻ. It is likewise enough to suggest to you that peoples bags are empty of these gems.¹

He then goes on to extoll the virtues of *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* and goes on to press upon the reader to refer to some of its chapters in order to really appreciate it.²

Regarding *al-Kāfi* the reality has already come to the fore in terms of it containing such exaggerations and disbelief which are beyond the comprehension of men. It is sufficient to merely scan through the titles of the chapters to ascertain this.

1 Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar: *al-Shī‘ah wa al-Imāmāh* p. 101.

2 *Al-Khuṭūṭ al-‘Arīḍah* p. 102.

Chapter Two

Their Link with the Ancient Sects

What is the link between these people and the old Shī'ī sects that feature frequently in the books of heresiography?

What I have noticed is that when the contemporary Shī'ah clergy talk of their sect, its scholars and its empires, they attribute all the Shī'ī sects, dynasties and scholars to it even though they might be from the Ismā'īliyyah, the Bāṭiniyyah (those who belief in the esoteric interpretation of the Shar'ī texts), the atheistically inclined heretics or the extremist anthropomorphists.

So, for example, when they talk of the dynasties of the Shī'ah, at the very top of the list they talk of the Fatimid dynasty despite it not subscribing to the Twelver dogma.¹

Likewise, when making mention of their scholars you will find many of the spearheaders and subsequent eponyms of various deviant sects and heretical groups, which had no affiliation to the Twelver creed, mentioned among them.

Hence, by way of example, you will notice that the Shī'ī scholar Muḥsin al-Amīn makes the following approbatory remarks regarding the Hishāmiyyah, the followers of Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam, the Yūnusiyyah, the followers of Yūnus ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Qummī, the Shayṭāniyyah, the followers of Muḥammad ibn al-Nu'mān (commonly known as Shayṭān al-Ṭāq) and other groupings:

إنهم عند الشيعة الإمامية كلهم ثقات صحيحوا العقيدة فكلهم إمامية وإثنا عشرية

According to the Imāmiyyah they are all reliable people and bearers of the correct dogma, hence they are all Imāmiyyah and Twelvers.²

1 See: *al-Shī'ah fī al-Mīzān*: chapter regarding the Shī'ī dynasties p. 127, onwards; *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1/44; likewise see *Duwal al-Shī'ah* of Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah.

2 *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1/21.

In fact what is even more grave is that the Twelvers endeavour to embrace every sect which somehow or the other was associated to Shī'ism, even though it might have been on clear disbelief as acknowledged in the classical books of the Shī'ah themselves.

You will thus notice that they accord sanctity and holiness to the likes of the Nuṣayriyyah who are extremist in their disbelief according to the consensus of the Muslims. One of their contemporary scholars Ḥasan al-Shīrāzī has written a booklet which goes by the title *The 'Alawīs, The Partisans of the Ahl al-Bayt* ('Alawī is one of the names of the Nuṣayriyyah). In this booklet he mentions that he met the Nuṣayrīs in Syria and Lebanon upon the order of their chief scholar Muḥammad al-Shīrāzī and his impressions were that he found them to be from the partisans of the Ahl al-Bayt, characterised by purity of sincerity, and the feat of abiding by the truth. They are affiliated to 'Alī عليه السلام by way of believing in his successorship and some by way of that and by way of lineage...

He further states, "The terms 'Alawiyyīn' and 'Shī'ah' are synonymous just as the terms 'Imāmiyyah' and 'Ja'fariyyah' are synonymous."¹

Surprisingly, none of the scholars of the Twelvers have disavowed the sentiments of al-Shīrāzī, despite the fact that the Nuṣayrīs are infamous for their disbelief and heresies,² and despite the fact that the ancient books of the Shī'ah excommunicate them and consider them to be a sect out of the fold of Islam.³ But the contemporaries treat them as part of the Ja'fariyyah even though they have identified themselves differently.

One of their senior clerics has actually gone to the extent of asserting that there no more exists extremist sects among the Shī'ah today, the presence of the Nuṣayriyyah, the Durūz and the Agā Khāniyyah notwithstanding. It is as if he is classing them as non-extremist. Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā' says:

1 Ḥasan al-Shīrāzī: *al-'Alawiyyīn Shī'ah Ahl al-Bayt* p. 2-3.

2 *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 35/145, onwards.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/285.

إن جميع الفرق الغالية قد بادت ولا يوجد منها اليوم نافع ضرورة

All the extremist sects have come to end. Not even a blower in the fire from among them is to be found today.¹

Commenting upon this professor Sulaymān Dunyā writes the following:

فما يكون الآغاخانية أليسوا قاتلين بالحلول؟ أم ليسوا مع قولهم بالحلول ملاحدة؟ أم ليسوا منتسبين إلي الشيعة... ثم أليسوا علي رقعة الأرض اليوم

Then what is the status of the Agā Khāniyyah? Are they not proponents of incarnation? Or are they not heretics despite being proponents thereof? Or are they not affiliated to the Shī'ah? Or do they not exist on the surface of the earth?²

It would be correct to thus say that the names of many Shī'ī sects have disappeared into oblivion, but their beliefs have made their way into to the books of the Twelvers.

When the contemporaries assert their belief in the eight books and those that are equivalent to them in ranking, they implicitly accept all the doctrines and ideas of the various Shī'ī sects throughout history. Simply because these eight books were the rivers into which all the other minor Shī'ī streams and rivulets made their way. This is a reality for which there is abundant evidence, for you will notice that there is no belief which is upheld by any of those sects but that you will find some mention of it in the books of the Twelvers.

So, for example, the doctrine of Badā' was considered by the heresiographers to be the doctrine upheld by the extremist sect³ known as the Mukhtāriyyah.⁴ In

1 *Aṣl al-Shī'ah wa Uṣūluhā* p. 38; see also: *Da'wah al-Taqrīb* p. 75.

2 *Bayn al-Sunnah wa al-Shī'ah* p. 37.

3 See: Al-Shahrastānī: *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* 1/173.

4 They were the followers of Mukhtār ibn 'Ubayd al-Thaqafī. One of his beliefs was *Badā'* (*al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* 1/147-148). See the definition of Kaysāniyyah that has passed.

spite of that there appears sixteen narrations regarding it in their most canonical work *al-Kāfī*. Likewise, in *Biḥār al-Anwār* there are more than seventy narrations regarding the doctrine of *Badā'* and abrogation. And even though their scholars try to find a plausible explanation of *Badā'* in order to escape being excommunicated by the Muslims, it stands as one of the confirmed beliefs of their dogma.

Another example is the doctrine of *Raj'ah* which was also considered from the beliefs of the extremist. For the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah state and the books of the Twelvers concede that *Raj'ah* was one of the principle beliefs of Ibn Saba', despite that it is a confirmed doctrine in the dogma of the Twelvers.¹

Likewise, the doctrine of deifying the Imāms was the doctrine of the extremist sects like the Saba'iyyah. But you will find narrations which deify the Imāms in *al-Kāfī*, *al-Biḥār*, in their Quranic exegesis like that of *Tafsīr al-Qummī* and *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī*, and in their transmitter dictionaries like that of *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, as has passed already.

Another issue is according preference to the Imāms over the Ambiyā'. This was also the stance of the extremist, as has been established by 'Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī (d. 429 A.H), al-Qāḍī 'Ayāḍ (d. 544 A.H), and Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 728 A.H). However, this doctrine was also inherited by the Twelvers.²

Discussing this topic in depth requires a dedicated research. For studying the views of the ancient Shī'ī sects and juxtaposing them with what appears in the books of the Twelvers is a unique study which will reveal the extent to which this cult is linked with those ancient sects.

And the niche wherefrom these eerie beliefs found their way into Shī'ism was the scholars of the Shī'ah themselves whose bigotry compelled them to accept the narrations of a Shī'ī irrespective of his affiliations thereby rejecting the

1 Refer back to the chapter regarding *Raj'ah* pg 1223 of this book.

2 See p. 836 of this book.

narrations of those whom they term ‘the commonality’, i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah. Hence their scholar al-Ṭūsī has conceded that most of their ḥadīth transmitters belong to deviant schools but then still asserts that their books are reliable. This is abundantly clear to anyone who has any recourse to their books, for he will find some even affiliated to the Wāqifiyyah, the Faṭḥiyyah¹ and others.

Similarly, a contemporary Shīʿī thinker has acknowledged that the Twelver thought has encapsulated the views and ideologies of all the ancient Shīʿī sects. He says:

ولكن يجب أن نشير قبل أن نضع القلم بأن ما مر بنا من أفكار الشيعة مما كان خاصا بفرقة بعينها لم يلبث أن دخل كله في التشيع الاثني عشري ودعم بالحجج العقلية وبالنصوص، والتشيع الحالي إنما هو زبدة الحركات الشيعية كلها من عمار إلي حجر بن عدي إلي المختاروكيسان إلي محمد بن الحنفية أبي هاشم إلي بيان بن سمعان، والغلاة الكوفيين إلي الغلاة من أنصار عبد الله بن الحارث إلي الزيديين والإسماعيليين، ثم الإمامية التي صارت اثنا عشرية وقام بعملية المزج متكلموا الشيعة ومصنفوها.

But before we put the pen down it is important to note that all the ideas of the Shīʿah which we have discussed, each of which was an idea specific to a particular denomination, have all now been assimilated into the Twelver dogma and has been further substantiated and supported with evidence. Present day Shīʿism is thus an amalgam of all the previous Shīʿī movements from ‘Ammār to Ḥujr ibn ‘Adī, from Kaysān to Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah, from Abū Hāshim to Bayān ibn Sam‘ān, from the Kufī extremists to the extremist supporters of ‘Abd Allah ibn al-Ḥārith, the Zaydīs and the Ismāʿīlīs. Furthermore, the Imāmiyyah who later became the Twelvers and took up the task of assimilating everything are the theologians of the Shīʿah and their leading scholars.²

Present day Shīʿism is thus the essence of all the various Shīʿī ideologies with their extremism and radicalism. To the extent that even the extremist Sabaʿī tendency of deifying ‘Alī (عليه السلام) stares at us from the narrations of the Twelvers.

1 See the chapter regarding Sunnah pg. 413 of this book.

2 Muṣṭafā al-Shaybī: *al-Ṣīlah Bayn al-Taṣawwuf wa al-Tashayyū* p. 235.

This will be clear to anyone who merely peruses through the topics of the chapters established in *al-Kāfī* and *al-Bihār*.

Likewise the *Bāṭinī* (esoteric) tendency is also glaring in light of their interpretations of the Qur'ān, the fundamentals of Islam and their views regarding dissimulation and the concealment of knowledge. Hence the Twelver dogma has become the final pool for the various Shī'ī ideologies with their flaws and discrepancies. Every extremist will thus find therein his need and that which will support his school.

A very serious acknowledgment and controversial confession of one of their most senior contemporary scholars in the science of transmitter-impugning and approbation came to the fore. One of the aspects contained therein is the admission that the dogma is continuously changing and evolving, and that the beliefs that the Twelvers hold today were considered extreme by the ancient Shī'ah, and that they, today, hold such beliefs which they consider essentially part of the dogma previously considered to be heretical. 'Abd Allāh al-Mamaqānī says the following in defending the reputation of Mufaḍḍal ibn 'Umar al-Ju'fī who was criticised by some of the ancient scholars:

إنا قد بينا غير مرة أن رمي القدماء الرجل بالغلو لا يعتمد عليه ولا يركن إليه لوضوح كون القول بأدني مراتب فضائلهم (يعني الأئمة) غلوا عند القدماء، وكون ما نعهده اليوم من ضروريات مذهب التشيع غلوا عند هؤلاء، وكفأك في ذلك عد الصدوق نفى السهو عنهم غلوا، مع أنه اليوم من ضروريات المذهب، وكذلك إثبات قدرتهم علي العلم بما يأتي (أي علم الغيب) بتوسط جبرائيل والنبي غلوا عندهم ومن ضروريات المذهب اليوم

We have mentioned more than once previously that the criticisms of the ancients regarding someone being an extremist are not worth consideration. For it is clear that enumerating the least of their accolades, i.e. of the Imāms, was considered exaggeration according to the early scholars. Likewise what we consider today to be essentially part of the Shī'ī dogma was also considered extremism according to them. In illustration thereof, it suffices to say that al-Ṣadūq considered the negation of forgetfulness

from the Imāms to be an exaggeration, but today it is treated as one of the integral tenets of our dogma. Likewise the aspect of them having access to the knowledge of the unseen was considered an exaggeration whereas today it is one of the essentials elements of the dogma.¹

It is abundantly clear from this text that the present day Shī'ah did not just suffice in following the heritage they inherited from the predecessors, rather they superceded them in their extremism and radicalism. To the extent that al-Ṣadūq and other scholars of the fourth century considered the one who believes that the Imāms do not forget or that the Imāms have knowledge of events to happen or, as suggested by al-Kulaynī, they have knowledge of all that happened and all that is to happen and that nothing is hidden from them, to be heretical and extremist beliefs. However, the dogma has evolved and these beliefs have now been incorporated therein, as is acknowledged by al-Mamaqānī. This means that according to the ancient Shī'ah the contemporaries ought to be treated as extremists whose statements are not worth accepting.

Take note that the holders of these beliefs were not deemed extremists by the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah but by the scholars of the Shī'ah themselves. Furthermore, this was their view in the fourth century when the dogma had already evolved and taken a specific form, then what do you suggest would be the view of the initial Shī'ah regarding them whose only understanding of Shī'ism was giving preference to 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ over 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

It is probably these phenomena that lead Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb to conclude that the understanding of religion always shifts and changes according to the Shī'ah. Alluding to this statement of al-Māmaqānī he states:

هذا تقرير علمي في أكبر وأحدث كتاب لهم في الجرح والتعديل يعترفون فيه بأن مذهبهم الآن غير مذهبهم قديما، فما كانوا يعدونه قديما من الغلو وينبذونه وينبذون أهله بسبب ذلك صار الآن -أي الغلو- من ضروريات المذهب، فمذهبهم اليوم غير مذهبهم قبل الصفويين، ومذهبهم قبل الصفويين غير مذهبهم

1 *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* 3/240; see also: 506 - 507 of this book.

قبل ابن مطهر. ومذهبهم قبل ابن مطهر غير مذهبهم قبل آل بابويه، ومذهبهم قبل آل بابويه غير مذهبهم قبل
شيطان الطاق، ومذهبهم قبل شيطان الطاق غير مذهبهم في حياة الحسن والحسين وعلي بن الحسين

This is an affirmation which appears in one of their latest and most monumental works in the science of impugning and approbating transmitters wherein they concede that their dogma today is very different than what it was previously. Hence what they considered as extremist ideas and casted aside has now become part of the essentials of the dogma. Their dogma today is thus very different to what it was before the Safawids, and their dogma before the Safawids was very different to what it was before Ibn Muṭahhar. Likewise their dogma before Ibn Muṭahhar was different from what it was before the family of Bābawayh, and what it was before the family of Bābawayh was different from what it was before Shayṭān al-Ṭāq, and lastly, their dogma before Shayṭān al-Ṭāq was very different from what it was during the lifetime of Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, and ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn.¹

1 *Ḥāmish al-Muntaqā* p. 193.

Chapter Three

The Doctrinal Connection between the Early Scholars and the Contemporaries

As long as there remains uniformity in the sources of acquisition, is there any need for us to investigate the doctrinal link between the early scholars and the contemporaries? Especially when those early sources have encapsulated majority of what the books of heresiography have documented of the views of the extremist Shī'ah and what they have not.

The question again is that is there any need for this type of a study?

In reality there is a need. This is because the contemporary Shī'ah have published booklets and opuscles in abundance. They have likewise excessively spread their propagators in the Muslim world. All to establish that the creed of the Shī'ah is no different from the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and to propagate that they have been wronged by their opponents who have accused them of beliefs and views with which they have nothing to do whatsoever. Many of their missionaries have actively called toward uniting the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah and have raised the banners of Islamic unity. Many centres have been erected, books have been compiled and missionaries have specialised in this particular area...

It has likewise been claimed that the contemporaries have disavowed the extremism which was infamously known to be the hallmark of their predecessors, and that the time has indeed come for the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah to converge on common grounds due to the plot of the enemy being too grave and in the condition of the Muslim world being too volatile.

Furthermore, when talking to them and telling them that in your books there is a particular narration or that a certain scholar of yours holds a particular view we will very often hear them saying "We do not agree with everything that appears

in our books,” or “Whatever a specific scholar says is his responsibility, for there is no binding evidence but in the words of the infallible Imāms.” And even, “The Ahl al-Sunnah aver the same.” In this regard we will find very often that they fabricate, exceed limits, and plot cunningly in strange ways.

There is thus a pressing need to discuss the views of the contemporary Shī'ah regarding crucial matters of Islam which make them very different from the majority or which are an obstacle between them and Islam.

Similarly, there are many Shī'ah writers who have been assigned the task of providing literature for the Muslim world and rebutting all the contentious issues which are raised around Shī'ism. And the doctrine of Taqiyyah has accorded them freedom of speech and laxity in applying rulings. Notwithstanding that there are special books which are not propagated in the Muslim world.¹ In other words there is an external face of the Shī'ah which is presented to the people through the different Shī'ī media platforms which popularise Shī'ism in the world and propagate it. And there is an internal face which does not come to the fore but in the Shī'ī seminaries and societies and in their fundamental most works like that of *al-Kāfī* and *Tafsīr al-Qummī*.

Unfortunately there are people who have fallen prey to this two-faced approach and have accepted it. And Shī'ism found its way into the hearts of a large amount of youth in the Muslim world and in the hearts of those who claim to have some sort of affiliation to Islamic movements; into the hearts of such people whom the tragic reality of the Muslim world has overwhelmed and caused to cry. As a result they started looking for solutions and answers. The image of the outright enemy which was vividly clear in front of them with all his might and cunningness obscured the identification of the hidden enemy who camouflaged himself with the disguise of Islam, so they accepted what was being said at face value and

1 For example the book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* of Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, some portions of *Biḥār al-Anwār* and the book *Nubuwwah Abī Ṭālib*, i.e. the prophethood of Abū Ṭālib which is written by the Shī'ī scholar Muzzammil Ḥusayn al-Maythamī al-Ghadīrī, amongst others.

were hasty in drawing conclusions. And they assumed that whatever is being promulgated regarding the divide between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah is all made-up, superficial, and not backed by any factual evidence whatsoever.¹

It is therefore necessary to listen to what some of their contemporary scholars have written regarding their integral beliefs which make them different from the Muslims. From these I will select those beliefs regarding which claims of reform, overhauling or addition brought about by extremism have been made so that the extent of their link with their predecessors becomes clear.

1 See: al-Sunnah wa al-Shī'ah Ḍajjah Mufta'ilah (The Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah a superficial divide).

Discussion 1: The Belief of the Contemporaries Regarding the Book of Allah

We will talk about this from two different perspectives:

1. First Perspective: Analysing the content of the books of the Shī'ah which claim that interpolation took place in the Qur'ān and likewise the views of some of the heretics among them who made such claims, and what do the contemporary Shī'ah say regarding this crucial issue which is an obstacle between them and Islam, whereas they actively call toward uniting with the Ahl al-Sunnah and raise the banners of Islamic unity.
2. Second Perspective: What do the contemporary Shī'ah say regarding those esoteric interpretations the implication whereof is the interpolation of the Qur'ān, and which make it a book other than the one which the Muslims are familiar with, as was presented in the discussions that have passed.

The First Perspective

Hereunder we will analyse the views of the contemporaries regarding the accusation of interpolation which is a frequently featuring theme in the books of the Shī'ah.

We will study the following four reactions:

1. Outright denial of its existence and appearance in their books.
2. Acknowledging its existence and an attempt to give a plausible explanation.
3. Defiantly proclaiming it and providing evidence for it.
4. Pretending to reject it and attempting to establish it in deceitful ways.

The First Reaction: Outright denial of its existence in their books

A group of their scholars have taken the route of completely denying its existence in their books. One such scholar is ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Amīnī al-Najafī, in his refutation of Ibn Ḥazm who attributes this preposterous belief to the Shī‘ah he says the following in his book *al-Ghadīr*:

ليت هذا المجترئ أشار إلي مصدر فريته من كتاب للشيعه موثوق به، أو حكاية عن عالم من علمائهم
تقيم له الجامعة وزنا، بل تتنازل معه إلي قول جاهل من جهالهم أو قروي من بسطائهم أو ثرثار، كمثل هذا
الرجل يرمي القول علي عواهنه. وهذه فرق الشيعة وفي مقدمتهم الإمامية مجمعة علي أن ما بين الدفتين
هو ذلك الكتاب لا ريب فيه

If only this brash person pointed to a reliable source from the books of the Shī‘ah, or at least quoted a scholar who is held in great esteem by the Shī‘ī clergy. If not that then he should have referred to an ignorant person from amongst their ignoramuses, or even a Bedouin or a chatterbox from their simple people, as is the condition of this person who without restraint lodges accusations. Here are all the sects of the Shī‘ah at the forefront of who is the Imāmiyyah, and they all unanimously agree that whatever is between the two covers is that book wherein there is no doubt.¹

Likewise ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn Sharaf al-Dīn al-Mūsawī:

نسب إلي الشيعة القول بالتحريف بإسقاط كلمات وآيات فأقول نعوذ بالله من هذا القول ونبرأ إلي الله
من هذا الجهل. وكل من نسب هذا الرأي إلينا جاهل بمذهبنا أو مفتر علينا، فإن القرآن الحكيم متواتر من
طرقنا بجميع آياته وكلماته

It has been attributed to the Shī‘ah that they aver that interpolation has occurred by way of the omission of few words and verses. I say, “We seek the refuge of Allah from such a view and we express our disassociation before Allah from such ignorance. Whoever has attributed this to us is ignorant of our creed and is an accuser, for the wise Qur’ān is widely transmitted through our transmissions with all its verses and words.”²

1 *Al-Ghadīr*: 3/94-95. Similar is asserted by their scholar Luṭf Allah al-Ṣāfi in his book *Ma‘ al-Khaṭīb fi Khuṭūṭihī al-‘Arīḍah* p. 71.

2 *Ajwibah Masā’il Jār Allah* p. 28-29.

Luṭf Allāh al-Ṣāfi has likewise denied the fact that the book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* was written to establish this preposterous belief and avers that it was rather written to debunk it.¹ Just as there are others who have tried to defend al-Kulaynī, who is one of the spearheads of this belief.²

Analyses

Denying that which is already there does not help the apologetics, and will be construed as *Taqiyyah* according to the Shī'ah and those of the Ahl al-Sunnah who

1 Book *Ma' al-Khaṭīb fī Khuṭūṭihī al-'Aṭīdah* p. 64-66.

2 The author of 'Aṭīdah al-Shī'ah says the following:

النقص لا يدعيه أحد من علماء الإمامية حتى ثقة الإسلام الإمام الكليني رضي الله عنه، فإنه يعتقد بنزاهة القرآن وصيانته عن النقص والزيادة، ومع ذلك فقد تهجم الشيخ أبو زهرة وتحامل عليه وأكثر من الطعن فيه.

None of the scholars of the Shī'ah, including al-Kulaynī claim that omission occurred in the Qur'ān! For he (al-Kulaynī) believed that the Qur'ān is pure from omissions and additions. But despite that Abū Zuhrah has brazenly lampooned him and has excessively criticised him. ('*Aṭīdah al-Shī'ah* p. 162).

He also says:

إن الكليني لا يقول بنقص القرآن، فكيف يجوز لمسلم أن ينسب إليه هذا القول، وكيف جاز للشيخ أبو زهرة أن ينسبه إليه دون تورع، وكيف جاز له أن يهاجمه بتلك المهاجمة القاسية.

Al-Kulaynī was not of the opinion of omission taking place in the Qur'ān. How is it then possible for a Muslim to attribute that to him? And how is it then permissible for Shaykh Abū Zuhrah to attribute that to him without caution? How is it ok for him to attack him so ferociously?"

In refutation thereof I say that this was initially attributed to him by the scholars of the Shī'ah themselves. And his book *al-Kāfi* is a testimony to this and it is an indictment upon him and upon the Shī'ah till the end of time. Had a copy of *al-Kāfi* reached the scholars of Islam their ruling regarding the Twelvers would have been very different than what it is. Abū Zuhrah relied upon the attribution of al-Kāshānī who has attributed this belief to him in his *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* (*Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 1: 52: introduction no. 6). And al-Kāshānī is one of the central scholars of the Twelver dogma, for he is the author of *al-Wāfi* which combines all four of their early canonical works and is considered one of the reliable books of the dogma according to them.

Similar has been attributed to him by Nūrī the last prominent cleric and ḥadīth scholar in his book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* (see: *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 30-31) and others, as has passed already.

So do these people think that this is unknown to the Ahl al-Sunnah? And how do they defend the position of al-Kulaynī who has blurted such disbelief and satirised the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم with whom Allah was pleased and who were pleased with him.

are aware of what appears in their books. Hence the issue at hand today is much graver than can be simply brushed aside. For the publishing houses of Najaf and Tehran have disgraced them and have divulged their secrets. And their scholar al-Ṭabarsī has disclosed that which was hidden in what he has put together in his book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*. This type of an approach is thus of no avail.

Unsurprisingly, this is the approach that they go by in everything that distinguishes them from the Muslims, as has been alluded to by their scholar al-Ṭūsī in his book *al-Istibṣār* in more than one place. He mentions that whatever is the locus of consensus among the Ahl al-Sunnah is fertile grounds for practicing Taqiyyah.¹ It is based on this principle that they have rejected all those narrations which are in harmony with the Muslim majority and which reflect the true creed of the Ahl al-Bayt, and have ever since lived with Muslims deceitfully agreeing with them overtly and opposing them covertly. However, it wasn't long before this Taqiyyah was exposed in contemporary times, for their books have become accessible to many.

So, for example, the Najafī scholar, who in his refutation of Ibn Ḥazm, demanded that he, Ibn Ḥazm, establish his claim by referring to any reputable Shī'ī scholar, do you think that he was unaware of what appears in *al-Kāfī* and *Biḥār al-Anwār* and that which their scholars have written regarding this blasphemous belief, mention of aspects whereof has passed? And was he really thinking that anyone who has access to any of their books wherein it features would be easily misled?

What is more surprising is that although he himself has refuted the existence of this belief in the third volume of his book, he has gone on to establish it explicitly in the ninth volume. Hence he says, amidst his discussion regarding the allegiance that the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār pledged to Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه which had united the Ummah and deflated the plots of the enemies:

بيعة عمت شؤمها الإسلام وزرعت في قلوب أهلها الآثام... وحرفت القرآن وبدلت الأحكام

1 *Al-Istibṣār* 4/155.

It was a pledge the bad-omen whereof engulfed Islam and planted sins in the hearts of its adherents. By virtue of it the Qur'ān was interpolated and the injunctions were distorted.¹

Rather he has even cited a forged verse in this very book.² In this way does he go about affirming what he was previously negating. This particular approach, i.e. affirming at times and denying at times, or making a presence before people with contradictory opinions and non-conforming texts is a normal approach which we find in their traditions and in the statements of their scholars. And the reason for this approach is mentioned in some of their reports, which is taking advantage of the ignorance of the Ahl al-Sunnah with regards to the reality of their dogma owing to which they will have no room to target them in any way.³

As for the style of 'Abd al-Ḥusayn in rebutting this blasphemous belief, it entails such cunningness and prevarication as cannot be picked up by someone who is not aware of their strategies and plots. Reflect over his statement, "For the wise Qur'ān is widely transmitted through our transmissions with all its verses

1 *Al-Ghadīr* 9/388.

2 The fabricated verse reads as follows:

اليوم أكملت لكم دينكم بإمامته فمن لم يأت به ومن كان من ولدي من صلبه إلى يوم القيامة فأولئك حبطت أعمالهم وفي النار هم خالدون. إن إبليس أخرج آدم عليه السلام من الجنة مع كونه صفوة الله بالחסد فلا تحسدوا فتحبط أعمالكم وتزل أقدامكم

Today I have completed your Dīn for you with his Imāmah. Hence whoever does not follow him and those who of his children from my progeny till the Day of Judgment, their deeds are indeed rendered invalid and they will remain forever in hell-fire. Verily Shayṭān removed Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام from Jannah despite him being the chosen servant of Allah because of jealousy. Therefore do not be jealous or else your deeds will be rendered invalid and your feet will stagger. (Ibid. 1/214-215).

The fabricated nature of the verse is obvious from its otherwise poor language and meaning. Despite that this Rāfiḍī claims that Rasūl Allah ﷺ said that it was revealed regarding 'Alī رضي الله عنه. And in an attempt to mislead the readers he attributes this lie to the Sunnī Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, whereas in actual fact it ought to be attributed to the Shī'ī Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, provided that the attribution exists. He has thus lied against Allah سبحانه وتعالى, His Messenger ﷺ, and the scholars of the Muslims.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/65; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 2/236.

and words.” What does he mean by the Qur’ān being transmitted by way of mass transmission through their chains? Does he mean the Qur’ān which is in front of us or the Qur’ān which is with the awaited Mahdī, as they allege.

The specification that it is widely transmitted through their chains subtly suggests the second meaning. This is because one of the crucial reasons for the preservation of the Qur’ān was the importance and attention accorded to it by the two giants of Islam, Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما, whose efforts were subsequently culminated with the efforts of their brother ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه who compiled it and unified its script, as a manifestation of the promise of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ

Indeed, it is We who sent down the Qur’an and indeed, We will be its guardian.¹

And the belief of the Shī‘ah regarding the first three Khulafā’ is known, so the Qur’ān then is not actually widely transmitted through them.

As to the foolish attempt of Luṭf Allāh al-Ṣāfī and Āghā Buzruk al-Ṭahrānī to conceal the greatest indictment upon the Twelver dogma which cannot be denied, i.e. the book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, it is an attempt in vein. Especially when it has now left the Shī‘ī circles and has reached the hands of the Ahl al-Sunnah, it has rather reached the hands of the enemies of the Muslims who can learn how to plot against the Ummah and its traditional legacy.²

In addition, the author thereof has explicitly mentioned his goals in his introduction and has tried to advance evidence to prove his point. Is it then still possible to conceal his position when he has gathered all their fallacious reports and the views of their scholars which were scattered in this regard?

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9.

2 A Shī‘ī scholar by the name Muḥammad Mahdī al-Aṣḥāhānī has made mention of this in his book *Aḥsan al-Wadī‘ah* p. 90.

The Second Reaction: Acknowledging its Existence and Attempting to Give a Plausible Explanation

This acknowledgement has taken many forms. Hence one of their scholars has written a book wherein he acknowledges that there are some narrations which talk of the interpolation of the Qur'ān but then further says:

إنها ضعيفة شاذة وأخبار آحاد لا تنفد علما ولا عملا، فإما أن تقول بنحو من الإعتبار أو يضرب بها الجدار

They are weak, anomalous and reported by single narrators which do not give the benefit of epistemological certainty nor categorical practice; they can either be given some sort of consideration or they can be smashed against the wall.¹

Another scholar has written that they are established reports but:

المراد في كثير من روايات التحريف من قولهم عليهم السلام كذا نزل هو التفسير بحسب التنزيل في مقابل البطلن والتأويل

What is meant by the narrations of interpolation in their statements, “this is how it was revealed,” is the exegesis in terms of revelation in comparison to esoteric interpretations.²

Whilst a third set of scholars have written that the Qur'ān that we have ahead of us is not interpolated, rather it is incomplete and the verses regarding the immediate succession of 'Alī have fallen away and:

كان الأولي أن يعنون المبحث تنقيص الوحي أو يصرح بنزول وحي آخر وعدمه حتي لا يتمكن الكفار من التمويه علي ضعفاء العقول بأن في كتاب الإسلام تحريفا باعتراف طائفة من المسلمين

1 Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā': *Aṣḥ al-Shī'ah* p. 63-64.

2 Al-Ṭabṭabā'ī: *al-Mīzān Fī Tafsīr al-Qur'ān* 12/108.

The discussion revolving around it ought to be labelled ‘omission of the revelation’ or ought to be explicitly stated as ‘the descendance of another revelation or its absence’. This is so that the disbelievers are not afforded the opportunity to confuse the vulnerable people by claiming that interpolation has taken place in the book of Islam as is acknowledged by a group of the Muslims.¹

And yet a fourth scholar has written that:

نحن معاشر الشيعة نعتقد بأن هذا القرآن الذي بين أيدينا الجامع بين الدفتين هو الذي أنزله الله تعالى علي قلب خاتم الأنبياء صلي الله عليه وسلم من غير أن يدخله شيء بالنقص أو بالزيادة كيف وقد كفل الشارع بنفسه تعالى: إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ علي أنا معاشر الشيعة (الإثني عشرية) نعرف بأن هناك قرآنا كتبه الإمام علي رضي الله عنه بيده الشريفة بعد أن فرغ من كفن رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم وتنفيذ وصاياه، فجاء به إلي المسجد النبوي فنبذه الفاروق عمر بن الخطاب قائلا للمسلمين حسبا كتاب الله وعندكم القرآن، فرده الإمام علي إلي بيته ولم يزل كل إمام يحفظ عليه كوديعة إلهية إلي أن ظل محفوظا عند الإمام المهدي القائم عجل الله تعالى فرجنا به

We the Shī'ah believe that this Qur'ān which is gathered between the two covers is revealed by Allah ﷻ upon the heart of the Seal of all Prophets ﷺ without any addition or omission. How could it have been otherwise when Allah the legislator has himself said, “Indeed, it is We who sent down the Qur'an and indeed, We will be its guardian.” However, we the Shī'ah (Twelvers) do concede that there is another Qur'ān which Imām 'Alī has written with his blessed hand after having finished the burial procedures of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and executing his bequests? He then brought it to the Masjid of Nabī ﷺ but 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb disregarded it saying to the Muslims that the Book of Allah is sufficient for you and you already have a Qur'ān. Hence the Imām returned it to his household and every subsequent Imām preserved it considering it to be a divine trust. It finally became secured by the Mahdī, may Allah ﷻ grant us quick relief by way of his emergence.²

1 Āghā Buzruk al-Ṭahrānī: *al-Dharī'ah* 3/313-314.

2 Al-Khurāsānī: *al-Islām 'alā Ḍaw' al-Tashayyū'* p. 204.

The fifth viewpoint posits the following:

وقع بعض علماء المتقدمين بالإشتباه فقالوا بالتحريف ولهم عذرهم كما لهم اجتهدهم وإن أخطأوا
بالرأي، غير أنا حينما فحصنا ذلك ثبت لنا عدم التحريف فقلنا به وأجمعنا عليه

Some of our early scholars fell into the blunder of interpolation. They are excused, for they had their reasoning and evidence even though they erred. But when it became clear to us that interpolation has not occurred we accepted it and unanimously affirmed it.¹

And the sixth position taken by some is that only those scholars who could not differentiate the authentic narrations from the unauthentic ones took the position of interpolation, i.e. the *Akhbārīs* (the textualists). As for the *Uṣūlīs*, they deny this blasphemy.²

Analyses

We will analyse these reactions in the sequence that they were presented:

Firstly: To say that those blasphemous assertions are weak or anomalous narrations according to the Shī'ah is debunked by the fact that a group of their leading scholars like al-Mufīd, al-Kāshānī, and Nī'mat Allah al-Jazā'irī have opined that they are widespread and categorically established. Rather al-Majlisī has concluded that they are as authentic in their abundance and popularity as are the narrations of Imāmah, as has passed. Furthermore interpolation was the official position taken by many of their great scholars.

Denying those narrations and merely reducing them to anomalous ones despite their abundance, as acknowledged by many of their scholars, is indeed a reflection of the extent of the lying which exists in this cult. If this view was really based on truth, then it should have prompted further investigation into the other beliefs of the Shī'ah which have separated them for the Muslims. It should likewise

1 Nashr Nādī al-Khāqānī: *al-Shī'ah wa al-Sunnah fī al-Mizān* p. 48-49.

2 Al-Ṭabṭabā'ī: in his annotations on *al-Anwār al-Nu'māniyyah* 2/259.

have prompted the overall scrutiny of all their narrations and transmitters. Subsequently, whoever has narrated those problematic narrations and made them his official creedal position like that of al-Kulaynī and Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, who have played the biggest role in entrenching this belief in the Shīʿī ideology and its propagation; should no more have been trusted and relied upon.¹

Secondly: As for the view that what is meant by the Shīʿī narrations in this regard is the interpolation of some texts which were revealed for the exegesis of the verses of the Qurʾān, it is just an affirmation of interpolation and not a defence thereof. This is so, due to the fact that the one who is willing to distort, reject, and discard those texts which came down from Allah to expound on the Qurʾān and clarify it would be more willing to reject and distort the verses themselves. For how can someone who is not trustworthy in the meaning be trustworthy in the wording. Furthermore, if the meanings are lost to distortion than what value remains for the mere words? Also, how can the exegesis of the Ṣaḥābah عليهم السلام be distortions according to this cult and the ‘distortions’ of al-Qummī, al-Kulaynī, and al-Majlisī which when read by anyone who has even a little knowledge of the Arabic language will pick up that they are heresies, be valid exegesis? And if the meanings of the Qurʾān are lost and have disappeared with the awaited Mahdī, then how is the Ummah expected to receive guidance? Or should it remain lost and misguided?

You will furthermore notice that the examples of the exegesis of the Imāms which they present before us, merely deliberating over them is enough to discern their

1 However, the holder of this view which we are analysing, i.e. Muḥammad Āl Ḥusayn Kāshif al-Ghiṭāʾ, reveres some of these heretical Shīʿah who openly proclaim this disbelief. He thus says the following regarding al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī, the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*:

حجة الله علي العالمين معجب الملائكة بتقواه، من لو تحلي الله لخلق له لقال هذا نوري، مولانا ثقة الإسلام حسين النوري

The evidence of Allah upon the world, admired by the angels for his piety. A man of such calibre that if Allah were to appear before his creation he would say, “This is my Nūr. This is our master the authentic transmitter of Islam al-Nūrī. (Muḥammad Āl Ḥusayn Kāshif al-Ghiṭāʾ: introduction of *Kashf al-Astār* (published by: Muʾayyid al-ʿUlamāʾ al-Jadīdah, Qum) of al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī. This lauding was after al-Nūrī had perpetrated this crime.

falsity. So how can these be the divine exegesis which the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ rejected, as they allege?

Lastly, this explanation of the blasphemous belief is not coherent with many of their narrations, for many among them explicitly state that the divine text itself was affected by change and omission in its words.¹ So this explanation is not a safe route out of this blasphemy and indictment. The right stance is the outright rejection of these narrations and the excommunication of those who believed in them.

Thirdly: To likewise say that the Qur’ān is incomplete and is not distorted is like the previous stance, not a defence of the Qur’ān but rather an affirmation of their fables and a criticism of the Qur’ān in a way which resembles a defence of it. For

1 For example they say that ‘Alī said:

وأما ما حُرف من كتاب الله فقولُه: كنتم خير أئمة أخرجت للناس فحُرِفَتْ إلى خير أمة. ومنهم الزناة واللاطاة والسراق وقطاع الطريق والظلمة وشراب الخمر والمضيعون لفرائض الله العادون عن حدوده، أفترى الله تعالى مدح من هذه صفته. ومنه قوله تعالى: أن تكون أمة هي أربي من أئمة فحرفوها وجعلوها أمة. ومثله في سورة عم ويقول الكافر ياليتني كنت ترابيا فحرفوها وقالوا ترابا وذلك لأن الرسول كان يكثر من مخاطبتي بأبي تراب ومثل هذا كثير

As for that which interpolated of the Qur’ān, it is the verse, “**You are the best of Imāms who have been taken out for the benefit of humanity,**” it was distorted to “The best of nations,” whereas in it are adulterers, sodomisers, thieves, highway robbers, oppressors, drunkards, those who discard the injunctions of Allah and those who transgress his limits.

Do you think that Allah will ever praise such a people?

(The fabricator of this narration may Allah curse him, attempts to tarnish the reputation of the Companions of the Prophet ﷺ because the Qur’ān was revealed regarding them, and the Shī‘ī dogma is based upon their revilement, so they criticised the Qur’ān for that reason(. The narration continues:

Another verse is, “**So that one nation be more plentiful than the Imams,**” and they interpolated it to ‘nation’... likewise the verse, “Likewise we made you intermediary Imāms (i.e. between the prophet and the people) and they interpolated it to ‘nation’. Similar is the verse in Sūrah al-Naba’, it was “**And the disbeliever will say I wish a was a Turābī** (one who follows Abū Turāb, i.e. ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) and they interpolated it to Turāb (sand). And this is because Nabī ﷺ would often address me as Abū Turāb. And there are many other examples. (Biḥār al-Anwār 93-26-28)

a person who has the ability to omit a portion of the Qur’ān surely will have the ability to interpolate it. But a thing which emerges from its homelands is not considered strange, for the holder of this view is Āghā Buzruk al-Ṭahrānī who was the student of al-Nūrī—the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb Fī Taḥrīf Kitāb Rabb al-Arbāb* (The definitive conclusion in proving the distortion of the book of the absolute Lord of the lords).

It is due to this that you will see that this Tehrani tries to deceive the Muslims by claiming that the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* directly told him that his intention was defending the Qur’ān but he mistakenly titled his book wrongly.¹ But in doing so he exposes himself, for he claims that there is a remaining portion of the Qur’ān which is the completion of the Qur’ān and that it was more appropriate to have titled the book ‘*the incomplete nature of the Qur’ān and the descent of another divine revelation*’. How does he still have the audacity to claim that this is defending the Qur’ān from the enemies? This is the extent to which he tries to defend the Qur’ān and Islam! Pure are You, O Allah, this is indeed a great slander.

Fourthly: As for the assertion of the fourth category who claim that their Mahdī has another Qur’ān, it entails that the Dīn has not reached its culmination, whereas Allah ﷻ says:

الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ

This day I have perfected for you your religion.²

Furthermore, of what benefit is this absent book to the Ummah, which has disappeared with their Awaited Mahdī upon whose occultation centuries have passed? And if it is indispensable then what do the Shī’ah say regarding their predecessors who have passed centuries ago whilst being upon misguidance? And if the Ummah without it is on guidance then of what value are these claims.

1 He has mentioned this in his book *A’lām al-Shī’ah* in the first vol. of the second section p. 550.

2 Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 3

In reality all this nonsense is to convince their followership of their anomalous beliefs which have no support from the Book of Allah ﷻ. Hence they try to confuse them by telling them that the evidence for a particular issue is found in the other Qur'ān, or the complete Qur'ān, or that the expounder of the Qur'ān is the awaited Absent Imām.

Furthermore, the aspect of the existence of another Qur'ān and that of criticising the current one are both found in the canonical works of the Shī'ah as one issue; they both cannot be separated from each other. For they claim that 'Alī compiled the Qur'ān in its entirety and presented it to the Ṣaḥābah رضى الله عنه who subsequently rejected it and compiled their own Qur'ān wherein they omitted the mention of his immediate succession; and the alleged Qur'ān thus remained with the Imāms who successively inherited it till it eventually reached the hands of the Mahdī.

Hence this Shī'ī and whoever follows his approach intend to deceive and misguide. They gradually progress in their discussion in order to make this blasphemy plausible to the people by merely citing one angle of the discussion.

Fifthly: As to the fifth party which says that the stance of the interpolation of the Qur'ān is a wrong stance and is a deviation of our past which we once believed, but the truth has now become evident to us and we have thus abandoned it. Their recantation from this false stance indeed pleases a Muslim. However, it should be heeded that this assertion might be influenced by Taqiyyah. The indication of this is that the authors of the books which contained this disbelief are still venerated by these people. Whereas honesty in this regard demands that they completely disavow those scholars and their books. So for example al-Kulaynī in his *al-Kāfī* and al-Qummī in his *Tafsīr* have asserted this disbelief, but despite that how are they treated as leading scholars and reliable transmitters? Why are their books treated as seminal works for the derivation of doctrine and law; and why are their views trusted and actions emulated?

Furthermore, asserting that the Twelvers have unanimously withdrawn from this belief is violated by the doings of their contemporary scholar Ḥusayn al-Nūrī

al-Ṭabarsī who wrote his book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* in order to prove this heresy. It is likewise violated by the book *Tahrīf al-Qurʿān*, in Urdu,¹ of another contemporary scholar ʿAlī Taqī al-Sayyid Abū al-Ḥasan al-Naqwī al-Lakhnawī (d. 1323 A.H.) and other books. It is likewise contradicted by the aforementioned stances of Āghā Buzruk al-Ṭahrānī, al-Amīnī al-Najafī and the others; a group amongst them always have a share in this heresy and deviance.

In addition, why should a person who holds an anomalous view regarding an issue which the Muslims have unanimously agreed upon, i.e. the soundness of the Book of Allah and its preservation, be considered excused on the basis of his reasoning? After all is it an issue wherein there is scope for reasoning? And are there any excuses or room for a plausible interpretation in such an issue?

Sixthly: As for the assertion of the last group that this heresy was not propounded by all the Twelvers but by a group amongst them, i.e. the *Akhbārīs* who do not make a distinction between authentic and lackluster narrations. This was an approach adopted by one of the old Shīʿī scholars, al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā. He says:

من خالف في ذلك من الإمامية لا يعتد بخلافهم، فأن الخلاف في ذلك مضاف إلي قوم من أصحاب الحديث (من الشيعة) نقلوا أخبارا ضعيفة وظنوا صحتها لا يرجع بمثلها عن المعلوم المقطوع علي صحته

The opposition of those who have opposed the Shīʿah in this regard is not worth consideration. Simply because it is attributed to a group of the literalists (amongst the Shīʿah) who narrated lackluster narrations and considered them to be authentic, such weak narrations that it is not permissible to divert from the categorically established based on them.²

This idea that the doctrine of interpolation is exclusive to the *Akhbārīs*, has likewise been emphasised and propounded by the greatest Shīʿī scholar and reference of his time Jaʿfar al-Najafī (d. 1227).

1 Al-Dharīʿah ilā Taṣānīf al-Shīʿah 3/394.

2 Al-Ṭūsī has quoted this from him in *al-Tibyān* 1/3 and so has al-Ṭabarsī in *Majmaʿ al-Bayān* 1/15.

But despite him being from the *Uṣūlīs*, the stance he takes regarding the narrations of interpolation is no less in its gravity than the stance of his Akhbārī brothers. This is because he states the following after mentioning the viewpoint of the Akhbārīs and debunking it by saying that it is invalid traditionally and logically and in light of that which is categorically known to be part of Dīn:

فلا بد من تنزيل تلك الأخبار إما علي النقص من الكلمات المخلوقة قبل النزول إلي سماء الدنيا، أو بعد النزول إليها قبل النزول إلي الأرض، أو علي نقص المعني في تفسيره. والذي يقوي في نظر القاصر التنزيل علي أن النقص بعد النزول إلي الأرض فيكون القرآن قسمين: قسم قرأه النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم علي الناس وكتبوه وظهر بينهم وقام به الإعجاز، وقسم أخفاه ولم يظهر عليه أحد سوا أمير المؤمنين رضي الله عنه، ثم منه إلي باقي الأئمة الطاهرين. وهو الآن محفوظ عند صاحب الزمان جعلت فداه

Therefore it is necessary to interpret those narrations to mean omission in those created words¹ before their descendance to the first heaven, or after their descendance to the first heaven and before their revelation to the earth. The Qur’ān is thus of two types: One: that which Rasūl Allah ﷺ read to the people which they subsequently wrote and established and which had its incapacitating nature. And the other is that which he concealed from the people and did not disclose to anyone besides Amīr al-Mu’minīn ﷺ and he to the remaining pure Imāms. It is now preserved by the man of the time (the Mahdī) may I be sacrificed for him.²

The author of *Kashf al-Ghiṭā’* was not so bold as to make the claims that al-Murtaḍā made, but he deviated in a jungle of conjecture and unappealing reasoning owing to which he ended in a situation worse than the one he was trying to avoid. He claimed that Nabī ﷺ concealed a portion of the Qur’ān and did not convey it to anyone in his Ummah besides ‘Alī and that he passed it on to his children and that today it is preserved by the Mahdī! Is there anything more to say after such a blatant slander?

1 This is because they believed like the Mu’tazilah that the Qur’an is a creation.

2 *Kashf al-Ghiṭā’* p. 299.

The Third Reaction: Defiantly Proclaiming and Providing Evidence for it

The Person responsible for this catastrophe is Ḥusayn al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī (d. 1320) who wrote his book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* in order to establish this alleged belief.

Probably it was the first time in history that the fables of the Shī'ah, the views of their scholars, and the fabricated verses which they claim in this regard were gathered in one book and printed and published. This book has become an indictment upon the Shī'ah for the rest of time. And if the Muslims had the strength and authority, many tribunals would have been called for in order to decide the faith of the Twelvers in light of this book, i.e. are they Muslims or are they out of the fold. The Muslims would have sighed with relief with the absence of those mercenaries who infiltrate the Muslim world in order to spread Shī'ism. And all those gullible people whom the scholars of the Shī'ah easily deceive would have awoken from their slumber—people who do not understand Shī'ism to be anything other than loving the Ahl al-Bayt—which will grant them entry into Jannah without reckoning.

Shaykh Iḥsān Ilāhī Ṣāḥib has published a very large portion of this book in his work *al-Shī'ah wa al-Qur'ān* coupled with citing the evidence of this calumniator and the misconceptions that he raises. Despite this exposing the Twelver Shī'ah to a very large extent, however, Shaykh Iḥsān has sufficed on citing these without any annotation or critique, which is extremely crucial especially when the author has raised twelve misconceptions in order to prove his conclusion. And although they are nothing but the threads of a spider web, but at times they can be misleading to people who have no knowledge of the Sharī'ah. It is therefore necessary to unfold his misconceptions, deconstruct them, and extirpate them from their roots. Therefore a brief presentation of the contents of this book will be presented hereunder, considering that the author thereof is a contemporary Shī'ī scholar, coupled with criticising it and deconstructing its misconceptions and blunders with the help of Allah.

Although the book of Iḥsān has reached every place in the Muslim world. But he did not reject or at least critique any of its content due to the matter being clearer

than should be clarified and due to presenting this false belief being enough to show its falsity. I say that whilst this approach is correct in terms of the belief itself, however, there is most certainly a need for refuting and deconstructing the misconceptions that appear therein.

The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* has lifted the veil from the belief of the Shī'ah regarding the interpolation of the Qur'ān, and in this regard has gathered all their scattered narrations and the verdicts of their scholars regarding them being widely transmitted and exceeding two thousand in amount. He has accused the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم of interpolating the Qur'ān and unanimously conspiring on doing so. He has not excluded anyone besides Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī, which in anyway is just a nominal exclusion because it necessitates the concurring of all (including 'Alī), for he did not reveal the unadulterated Qur'ān that was by him. not even during his Khilāfah.

He then presents 1062 narrations most of which state that many of the verses of the Qur'ān are incorrect. He then mentions the alleged correct verses from their fallacious books thereby rejecting what the Ummah has united upon and accepting what a handful of calumniators have asserted.

He was likewise not ashamed of documenting some chapters in their entirety which are normally circulated in the circles of the Shī'ah and do not feature in the normal Qur'ān. The signs of fabrication and forgery are clear from their wordings and meanings; they are not unclear but to an ignorant non-Arab person and cannot possibly be propagated by anyone besides a spiteful heretic.

He has likewise refuted the claims of those scholars who deny interpolation and has mentioned that the denial of the early scholars was based on *Taqiyyah* and that denying the narrations of interpolation is tantamount to denying the narrations of Imāmah due to them being interlinked.

This book which contains all this disbelief was published in Iran in 1298 A.H. It had not still fully made its appearance and the Shī'ah were already expressing their agitation toward it; one of their scholars describing this condition states:

فلا تدخل مجلسا في الحوزة العلمية إلا وتسمع الصّحة والعجة ضد ذلك الكتاب ومؤلفه وناشره
يسلقونه بالسنة حداد.

You will not enter any gathering from the gatherings of the academic seminary but that you will hear the people decrying this book and opposing it, its author and its publisher vitriolically.¹

Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb opines that the reason for the decry was that they wanted the issue of the interpolation of the Qur'ān to remain a secret within their circles and the narrations thereof to remain scattered within their reliable books; they did not want them to be gathered in one book, thousands of copies whereof would be published and which their opponents would come to know and would thus hold as evidence against them. And when some of their intelligent people expressed these concerns the author wrote a counterargument in the form of the book *Radd Ba'd al-Shubuhāt 'an Faṣl al-Khiṭāb fī Ithbāt Tahṛīf Kitāb Rabb al-Arbāb* (dispelling some misconceptions from *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*).²

Although some of the extremist Shī'ah have tried to conceal this preposterous belief at most times by way of *Taqiyyah* which has become the best resort and fort for them, and although many of those who believed in it and were actively part of the protest considered it crucial to conceal it in order to preserve the social status of the Shī'ah and their religion from being disparaged so negatively that it will bring the entire edifice of Shī'ism crumbling down, I do not concur with Muḥibb al-Dīn in this generalisation regarding all the Shī'ah. Rather I assert that there has always been a group among the Shī'ah who deny this disbelief and disavow it. They have also written books in refutation of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* due to this reason, like the book written by one of their scholars Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Mar'ashī titled *Risālah Fī Ḥifẓ al-Kitāb al-Sharīf min Shubhah al-Qawl bi al-Tahṛīf*.³

1 Al-Mar'ashī: *al-Ma'ārif al-Jaliyyah* p. 21.

2 *Al-Khuṭūṭ al-'Ariḍah* p. 11.

3 Manuscript (see *al-Ma'ārif al-Jaliyyah* p. 21).

I likewise have noted that in various places in *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* he has refuted the arguments of those who deny this disbelief from among his people and he debates with them. Whoever reads the book will realise that it was compiled in order to convince those Shī'ah who were not willing to accept this heretical belief.¹

Furthermore, the book that the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* wrote by the title *Radd Ba'd al-Shubuhāt 'an Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* was not, ostensibly, in order to debunk the viewpoint of those who said that this issue should remain a secret within their circles. This is because what Muḥibb alluded to actually played out like this:

When the book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* emerged their scholar Maḥmūd ibn Abī al-Qāsim (famously known as Mu'arrib al-Ṭahrānī) wrote a refutation thereof by the title *Kashf al-Irtiyāb fī 'Adm Taḥrīf al-Kitāb*. The author of *al-Dharī'ah* has documented for us the first argument of the *Kashf al-Irtiyāb* which implies the denial of interpolation and not a call for its concealment. The author of *al-Dharī'ah* says:

وأول شبهات كشف الإرتياب هو أنه إذا ثبت تحريف القرآن فليهود أن يقولوا إذا لا فرق بين كتابنا
وكتابكم في عدم الإعتبار

The first misconception² of *Kashf al-Irtiyāb* is that if the interpolation of the Qur'ān is established then it would give the Jews the niche to say that there is no difference between our book and your book in terms of not being preserved.³

Al-Ṭabarsī subsequently wrote a refutation thereof, which is probably what Muḥibb was referring to, titled *al-Radd 'alā Kashf al-Irtiyāb*.⁴ The author of *al-Dharī'ah* says:

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 360, onwards.

2 Notice that he has named the arguments misconceptions. This is because the author of *al-Dharī'ah* holds the same view as the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* and he thus names the arguments of *Kashf al-Irtiyāb* misconceptions plunging deeper into this belief. And why not, especially when the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* is his teacher whom he has very lavishly praised and exaggeratingly extolled.

3 Āghā Buzruk al-Ṭahrānī: *al-Dharī'ah ilā Taṣānīf al-Shī'ah* 18/9; under the letter 10/211 ,ك: under the letter ج.

4 Ibid. 10/211.

وكان يوصي كل من عنده فصل الخطاب أن يضم إليه هذه الرسالة التي هي في دفع الشبهات التي أوردتها الشيخ محمود عليه وهي فارسية لم تطبع بعد

And he would advise every person who had a copy of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* to add this booklet to it wherein he dispelled the misconceptions raised by Shaikh Maḥmūd. It is in Persian and has still not been printed.

The response of al-Ṭabarsī in his refutation of the arguments of *Kashf al-Irtiyāb* was more of an attempt to recant and thus is evidence of contradiction. This is because he says the following:

هذه مغالطة لفظية حيث إن المراد بالتحريف... غير ما حملت عليه ظاهرا للفظ، أعني التغيير والتبديل والزيادة والتنقيص وغيرها المحقق والثابت جميعها في كتب اليهود وغيرهم، بل المراد من التحريف خصوص التنقيص فقط في غير آيات الأحكام جزما، وأما الزيادة فلاجماع الثابت من جميع فرق المسلمين والاتفاق العام من كل منتحل للإسلام علي عدم زيادة كلام واحد في القرآن المجموع فيما بين هاتين الدفتين ولو بمقدار أقصر آية يصدق عليه كلام فصيح، بل الإجماع والاتفاق من جميع أهل القبلة علي عدم زيادة كلمة واحدة في جميع القرآن، بحيث لا نعرف مكانها. فأين التنقيص الإجمالي المراد لنا عما حملت ظاهر اللفظ؟ وهل هذا إلا مغالطة لفظية

This is a semantic misunderstanding, for what is meant by interpolation is not what the word outwardly suggests, i.e. change, distortion, addition and omission, etc., all of which has definitely occurred in the books of the Jews. Rather what is intended by the term interpolation is omission specifically in verses other than the verses of law. As for addition to the Qur'ān, the established unanimity of all the various sects of the Muslims and the general consensus of all those who subscribe to Islam is that no one's speech has been added to the Qur'ān which is characterised of whatever is between the two covers, even if it be the amount equal to the smallest verse which can be termed as eloquent. Rather the consensus of the Ummah is that not even a word has been added to the Qur'ān in a way that it cannot be pointed out. So what a vast difference between overall omission and what the term ostensibly suggests? And is this not but a semantic misunderstanding?¹

1 *Al-Dharī'ah* 10/221.

This is just a little of what appears in the two books which the author of *Al-Dharīʿah* has conveyed to us. And this discloses to us that the debate was really about whether interpolation occurred in the Qurʾān or not. It was not about the necessity of keeping it concealed although it does not rule out the possibility that there existed among the Shīʿah many who felt that it was necessary to keep it hidden in order to save the integrity of the dogma. However, it does rule out the generalisation of this possibility.

Having said that, the afore cited argument that the author has presented to us after having digested it from the actual Persian booklet written by the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* which I have cited verbatim is not void of traces of incorrectness in its Arabic, obscurity, contradiction, and *Taqiyyah*; the evidence whereof is completely clear from his speech, as is normally the habit of these Shīʿah.¹

Moving on, the author, may he receive from Allah what he deserves, has organised this book in to three introductory chapters and two other chapters.

In the first introduction he has cited a number of their narrations which talk of the compilation of the Qurʾān, based on their understanding thereof. For example, the narration of their ‘reliable’ scholar which reads as follows:

ما ادعي أحد من الناس أنه جمع القرآن كله، كما أنزل إلا كذاب. وما جمعه وحفظه كما أنزل الله إلا علي بن أبي طالب والأئمة من بعده

1 Notice that first he had denied any addition whatsoever being made to the Qurʾān, and then he steps back and says “Rather the consensus of the Ummah is that not even a word has been added to the Qurʾān in a way which we cannot point out” reflect over his statement ‘which we cannot point out’. By way of this statement he is subtly inclining to the view of the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* that indeed additions have been made to the Book of Allah ﷻ. The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, whilst making mention of the various ways in which change came about in the Qurʾān, ways inspired to him by the devil and motivated by his hatred for Islam and its people, says the following:

السابعة زيادة الكلمة كزيادة عن في قوله تعالى يسألونك عن الأنفال

The seventh way: adding a word, like عن in the verse يسألونك عن الأنفال (*Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 25).

Likewise his assertion that only omission has occurred in the Book of Allah does not excuse him from belying the verse, “Verily We have revealed the Remembrance, and We are its Protectors.”

Besides the liar, no one has ever claimed that he compiled the entire Qur'ān as it was revealed. And no one compiled it nor preserved it in the way it was revealed besides 'Alī and the subsequent Imāms.

This is based upon the Shī'ah doctrine of only considering one person, 'Alī, infallible and considering the entire Ummah astray. And this doctrine came about due to remnants of the Persian culture which consecrated its kings.

How foolish indeed! He rejects that upon which all the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ concurred and then claims that only the transmission of one person is reliable. These claims have no evidence to back them up and they only exist in the imagination of these people. This is because 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ himself and the Ummah has not known any other Qur'ān but this Qur'ān.

He then goes on to narrate narrations regarding the Qur'ān of 'Alī wherefrom, as they allege, not one letter was omitted. He cites a group of their narrations which when studied make a person realise that the Shī'ī psyche is the quickest to believe in hogwash and fables. For it believes in a book that does not exist anywhere other than in their fables, and disbelieves in a book which was unanimously accepted by the Ummah, including the Imāms. These fables talk of how 'Alī had compiled the Qur'ān and how the Ṣaḥābah refused to accept it.

One among these narrations is the narration of the Shī'ī who allegedly met the awaited Mahdī (who was not born at all) and whom the Mahdī addressed by saying the following:

لما انتقل سيد البشر محمد بن عبد الله صلي الله عليه وآله من دار الفناء وفعلا صنما قريش ما فعلا من نصب الخلافة جمع أمير المؤمنين رضي الله عنه القرآن كله ووضع في إزار وأتي به إليهم وهم في المسجد، فقال لهم: هذا كتاب الله سبحانه أمرني رسول الله صلي الله عليه وسلم أن أعرضه عليكم لقيام الحجة عليكم يوم العرض بين يدي الله تعالى، فقال فرعون هذه الأمة ونمرودها: لسنا محتاجين إلي قرآنك، فقال له: أخبرني حبيبي محمد صلي الله عليه وآله بقولك هذا وإنما أردت بذلك إلقاء الحجة عليكم فرجع أمير المؤمنين إلي منزله... فنادي ابن أبي قحافة بالمسلمين وقال لهم: كل من عنده قرآن من آية أو سورة فليأت بها فجاءه أبو عبيدة بن الجراح، وعثمان، وسعد بن أبي وقاص، ومعاوية بن أبي سفيان،

وعبد الرحمن بن عوف، وطلحة بن عبد الله، وأبوسعيد الخدري، وحسان بن ثابت وجماعات المسلمين وجمعوا هذا القرآن وأسقطوا ما كان فيه من المثالب التي صدرت عنهم بعد وفاة سيد المرسلين صلي الله عليه وآله. فلذا ترى الآيات غير مرتبطة، والقرآن الذي جمعه أمير المؤمنين بخطه محفوظ عند صاحب الأمر عجل الله فرجه وفيه كل شيء حتي أُرش الخدشة. وأما هذا القرآن فلا شك ولا شبهة في صحته، وأنه من كلام الله سبحانه، هكذا صدر عن صاحب الأمر

When the leader of humanity Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allah ﷺ departed from this ephemeral world and the two idols of Quraysh¹ did what they did regarding the nomination of a Khalīfah, Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه compiled the entire Qur’ān and covered it in a loin cloth, brought it to the masjid, presented it to them and said the following, “This is the book of Allah ﷻ which Rasūl Allah ﷺ has ordered me to present to you in order to establish evidence against you on the Day of Reckoning before Allah ﷻ.” In response, the Fir‘awn and the Namrūd² of this Ummah said the following, “We are not in need of your Qur’ān.” To which he replied, “My beloved had foretold me of your response, I, however, only presented it to you in order to marshal evidence against you,” and subsequently returned to his house. Ibn Abī Qūḥāfah proclaimed amongst the Muslims, “Whoever has any portion of the Qur’ān written should produce it.” subsequently, Abū ‘Ubaydah ibn al-Jarrāḥ, Ṭalḥah ibn ‘Abd Allah, Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī, Ḥassān ibn Thābit, and droves of Muslims came to him and they compiled the Qur’ān. After the demise of the master of the prophets ﷺ they, however, omitted all the demerits that were contained therein, which they were guilty of. You will thus find that the verses are not organised systematically. As for the Qur’ān that Amīr al-Mu‘minīn compiled, it is preserved in his hand writing by the lord of the time [Mahdī] (may Allah hastened his release). Therein is everything, even the recompense for a scratch. As for the status of this Qur’ān, there is no doubt in its authenticity and in it being the word of Allah ﷻ. This is what the Mahdī had said.³

1 Referring to al-Ṣiddīq and al-Fārūq, the two who established the empire of Islām after Rasūl Allah ﷺ

2 Referring to ‘Umar al-Fārūq who conquered the lands of Persia and spread Islām therein. The only reward these people could think of for him was revilement and excommunication.

3 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 9-10

I have cited the narration in its entirety despite its length due to all their stories revolving around it. In essence the belief is thus a result of the hatred these people have for the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and for the Dīn that they barred.

As you can see, the discussion is about the demerits of the Ṣaḥābah and that whoever compiled the Qur'ān omitted them. They have thus divulged the hidden secret and what their hearts bare is even greater.

But, if the Ṣaḥābah abandoned the Qur'ān then why was the actual Qur'ān which 'Alī presented to them kept away from the people of the subsequent centuries? For if it served as inculpatory evidence against the Ṣaḥābah it cannot be such evidence against the subsequent generations? And why did 'Alī not establish this evidence against the people when he was in an authoritative position during his rule and Khilāfah? Their fables contradict one another internally.

And if the Ṣaḥābah rejected it, surely there would be someone throughout the subsequent centuries who would have accepted it, especially when they claim that some among them accompanied the Imāms and even met the awaited Mahdī, also notwithstanding that autonomous Shī'ī empires came about. So why would they then be deprived? And why should it then remain with the Mahdī in his hiding? Does this all not make it very clear that this is all nothing but nonsense, leaving aside all other evidences and their analyses?

Furthermore, the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* goes on to mention narrations in his introduction which suggest that 'Alī refused to give the Qur'ān to the Ṣaḥābah when they requested him for it due to averring that none but the pure could touch it and that no one is pure besides the Twelve Imāms.¹

This is indeed problematic. For it implies that 'Alī refused to convey the Qur'ān by claiming that it is specific to him and his children. No Muslim will dare to say this, let alone Amīr al-Mu'minīn عليه السلام. The motive behind this is tarnishing the

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 7.

reputation of the Ahl al-Bayt and lampooning them. It is for this reason that one of the Shīʿī sects, the Kāmiliyyah excommunicated ‘Alī عليه السلام from the community of the Muslims. These narrations which feature in the books of the Twelvers invariably lead to this conclusion. These people, thus, are cohorts of Shayṭān but definitely not the supporters of Amīr al-Mu’minīn. Those who exonerate Amīr al-Mu’minīn from all these falsities are indeed his supporters and helpers.

In the second introduction he produces examples of the types of interpolation which allegedly occurred in the Qur’ān. He cites various examples of interpolation in Sūrahs, verses, words and letters, all of which are of course a result of the whisperings of his devil to him.

He establishes that adding a chapter and replacing one with another is impossible¹ due to the verse:

وَإِنْ كُنْتُمْ فِي رَيْبٍ مِّمَّا نَزَّلْنَا عَلَىٰ عَبْدِنَا فَأْتُوا بِسُورَةٍ مِّثْلِهِ وَادْعُوا شُهَدَاءَكُمْ مِّنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ

And if you are in doubt about what we have sent down [i.e., the Qur’ān] upon Our Servant [i.e., Prophet Muhammad], then produce a sūrah the like thereof and call upon your witnesses [i.e., supporters] other than God, if you should be truthful.²

He thus asserts that in the Qur’ān which the Muslims have access to there is no addition of any chapter whatsoever, due to humans being incapable of producing a chapter like any of the chapters of the Qur’ān, but he then contradicts himself by stating that decreasing a chapter is very possible and cites as an example the omission of the chapter of *Wilāyah*.³

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 24.

2 Al-Baqarah: 23.

3 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 24.

This is because this claim in itself entails an additional chapter to the present Qur’ān, i.e. the chapter of *Wilāyah*, whereas he had just denied the possibility thereof earlier. Over and above that, the wording of the Sūrah suggests that it is a complete fabrication, this is attested to by one of the scholars of the Shī’ah themselves.¹ This chapter is characterised by a concocted text, a ludicrous structure, and disreputable meaning; all of which make it clear that it was fabricated by an ignorant non-Arab, as will appear.

He further asserts that increasing a verse in the Qur’ān or decreasing one is also impossible by way of consensus. But then he contradicts his claim by stating that decrease is possible.²

As for adding a word to the Qur’ān, in light of their fables he concludes that it is possible. He gives an example stating that the word *عن* in the forthcoming verse is an addition in the verse of the Qur’ān?

يَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الْأَنْفَالِ

They ask you, [O Muhammad], about the bounties [of war].³

The purpose behind this claim is that according to them the spoils of war were exclusively for Rasūl Allah ﷺ and subsequently for the twelve Imāms that succeeded him. But the Ṣaḥābah were asking Rasūl Allah to give them the spoils as charity and were not asking him about the ruling of the spoils. This meaning is only possible if the word *عن* (regarding) is omitted.

He further states that omitting a word is very common, like the omission of the word ‘Alī in many a verses, i.e. the name of ‘Alī had occurred multiple times according to them in the Qur’ān but the Ṣaḥābah omitted it.

1 His name is Muḥammad Jawwād al-Balāghī: in his book *Ālā’ al-Raḥmān* p. 24-25.

2 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 24.

3 Al-Anfāl: 1.

This claim is made in order to satisfy their followers who are doubtful regarding their dogma which is not backed by any verses in the Qur'ān. This is one of the most likely reasons which drove the Shī'ah to believe in this blasphemy. As for unlikely reasons, they are in order to destroy Shī'ism completely and distance the Shī'ah from Islam completely.

He then goes on to mention the various ways in which this alleged change in the words occurred in the Book of Allah and establishes in light of their fallacious narrations that this has indeed happened. He thus says: like changing the words آل محمد 'the family of Muḥammad in the following verse of chapter Āl 'Imrān:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ اصْطَفَىٰ آدَمَ وَنُوحًا وَآلَ إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَآلَ عِمْرَانَ عَلَى الْعَالَمِينَ

Indeed, God chose Ādam and Nūḥ and the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of 'Imrān over the worlds...¹

The purpose of the Shī'ah from this is to look for anything by way of which they can establish the mention of their Imāms in the Book of Allah, for how is it possible that the family of 'Imrān is mentioned in the Qur'ān but their Imāms are not mentioned at all?

He then goes on to discuss particles and asserts in light of their fables that adding and omitting particles from the Qur'ān is possible and has occurred. He states, "like the omission of the particle ا in the verse:

كُنْتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ

You are the best nation produced [as an example] for mankind.²

And the omission of the ي in the verse:

1 Āl 'Imrān: 33.

2 Āl 'Imrān: 110.

وَيَقُولُ الْكَافِرُ يَا لَيْتَنِي كُنْتُ تُرَابًا

And the disbeliever will say, “Oh, I wish that I were dust!”¹

The motive behind this forgery is obvious, for the Ummah of Muḥammad ﷺ according to this cult, whose hearts hatred has devoured, is accursed, astray and oppressive due to it conquering their lands and destroying their empires and propagating Islam amongst its people. It hurts them to find that Allah ﷻ has praised this Ummah, they have thus tried to divert the praise to their Twelve Imāms the last amongst whom was not even born at all. Therefore, they said that the word was actually *A'immah* and not Ummah.

Likewise the motive behind the forgery of the word *Turābiyy* is to attribute to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه who was given the title Abū Turāb which implies that the disbeliever will say, “How I wish I was a *Turābiyy*.” i.e. from the partisans of ‘Alī. The question is why would he not desire to be from the partisans of Muḥammad? Is ‘Alī better than Muḥammad?

And his senseless jabber which has put the Shī‘ah into the worst of positions and has tarnished their position forever continues.

The third introduction: therein he has mentioned the views of the Shī‘ī clergy regarding the interpolation of the Qur’ān. He thus says:

اعلم أن لهم في ذلك أقوالا مشهورها اثنان، الأول: وقوع التغير والنقصان فيه

Know well that they have many views in this regard. Famous amongst them are two: first: the occurrence of distortion and decrease in the Qur’ān.”

He thereafter lists those scholars who held this view, like al-Qummī in his *Tafsīr*, al-Kulaynī in his *al-Kāfī* (as he has asserted, they both have very vehemently

1 Al-Naba’ 40.

narrated abundant narrations in support of this viewpoint), al-Nu'mānī in *al-Ghaybah*, al-'Ayyāshī and Furāt al-Kūfī in their *Tafsīrs*, al-Mufīd in *al-Masā'il al-Surūriyyah* and al-Baḥrānī in *al-Durar al-Najafiyyah*.

In this way does he go about enumerating all their prominent scholars who were proponents of this fallacious belief mentioning their names with pompous titles, and at times even describing some of them by saying that they never ever erred in their lives, notwithstanding that this blunder itself is sufficient to gage how steeped they were in misguidance and disbelief. He also presents their statements in this regard, which have exposed the Shī'ah in the belated centuries. So for example, he quotes the statement of their scholar Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sharīf, the author of *Mir'āt al-Anwār* wherein he asserts that believing in this belief is part of the categorically established aspects of the Shī'ī dogma.¹

He then says:

الثاني: عدم وقوع التغيير والنقصان فيه، وأن جميع ما نزل علي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وآله هو الموجود بأيدي الناس فيما الدفتين، وإليه ذهب الصدوق في عقائده، والسيد المرتضي، وشيخ الطائفة في التبيان ولم يعرف من القدماء موافق لهم إلا ما حكاه المفيد عن جماعة من أهل الإمامة، والظاهر أنه أراد منها الصدوق وأتباعه

Second: the non-occurrence of change and omission therein and that whatever came down upon Rasūl Allah ﷺ is what is found in the two covers which is accessible to the people. To this view al-Ṣadūq has leaned in his 'Aqā'id, likewise al-Sayyid al-Murtaḍā and Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifāh in *al-Tibyān*. No one from the early scholars is known to have sided with them in this view with the exception of what al-Mufid has related regarding a group of the Shī'ah. But apparently he intended al-Ṣadūq and his followers.²

Notice that he endeavours to prove that the viewpoint of interpolation is the default view of the Shī'ī dogma. Otherwise the early scholars of the Shī'ī dogma

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 32.

2 *Ibid.* p. 33.

were free from this disbelief. The discussion regarding the roots of this belief and how it started has passed already.

He then goes on to mention the statements of the deniers and he debates their denial based on some narrations which appear in their books which establish this belief and eventually reaches the conclusion that it was not based on truth but rather it was a ploy in order to deceive the Ahl al-Sunnah.¹

And in the first chapter: he presents what he calls ‘the evidence which they use, whereas they can be used in substantiation of interpolation occurring in the Qur’ān’.

Therein he mentions twelve misconceptions, equal to the number of his A’immah.

The First Misconception

The heretic says:

الدليل الأول أن اليهود والنصارى غيروا وحرفوا كتاب نبيهم بعده، فهذه الأمة أيضا لا بد وأن يغيروا القرآن بعد نبينا صلى الله عليه وآله، لأن كل ما وقع في بني إسرائيل لا بد وأن يقع في هذه الأمة علي ما أخبر به الصادق المصدق صلوات الله عليه.

The first proof is that the Jews and the Christians distorted and interpolated the books of their prophet after them, this Ummah will thus also ineluctably distort the Qur’ān after our Nabī ﷺ. This is because whatever occurred in the Banī Isrā’īl is bound to occur in this Ummah as has been told to us by the truthful and the believed ﷺ.²

This misconception can be answered in various ways:

1 Ibid. 33, onwards.

2 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 36.

First of all, we agree that whatever occurred in the Banī Isrāʾīl will occur in the Ummah of Muḥammad ﷺ, but we assert that whatever is excluded by way of evidence is not part of this general statement, and one such issue is the interpolation of the Qurʾān. For it is an exception to this generalisation due to the verse of the Qurʾān:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ

Indeed, it is we who sent down the message [i.e., the Qurʾān], and indeed, we will be its guardian.¹

Can there be anything more powerful than limiting a ḥadīth with an explicit verse from the Qurʾān? Where are the brains of these people? It is for this reason that al-Bāqillānī has said:

أول جهلكم أنكم قطعتم بخبر واحد علي أن القرآن غير وبدل مع ردكم لما هو أقوى منه

The first sign of your ignorance is that you have averred on the basis of a limitedly transmitted report that the Qurʾān was distorted and interpolated, thereby rejecting that which is more powerful.²

Furthermore, Allah ﷻ had entrusted the people of the book with the preservation of the Torah and ordered them to preserve it. But they had breached the trust and failed to preserve it; they wittingly wasted it. Conversely, Allah ﷻ did not entrust anyone with the preservation of Qurʾān thereby allowing for its dissipation. Rather he himself assumed the responsibility of its preservation, as he mentions in the verse:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ

Indeed, it is we who sent down the message [i.e., the Qurʾān], and indeed, we will be its guardian.

1 Sūrah Al-Ḥijr: 9.

2 *Nukat al-Intiṣār* p. 104.

And the in the verse:

لَا يَأْتِيهِ الْبَاطِلُ مِنْ بَيْنِ يَدَيْهِ وَلَا مِنْ خَلْفِهِ تَنْزِيلٌ مِّنْ حَكِيمٍ حَمِيدٍ

Falsehood cannot approach it from before it or from behind it; [it is] a revelation from a [Lord who is] Wise and Praiseworthy.¹

This is because the Qur'ān is his final revelation, and Nabī ﷺ is His Final Messenger and with his death revelation came to an end. So it is the sheer grace of Allah ﷻ that he has taken it upon himself to preserve his book till the Day of Judgement so that it serves as a source of illumination and guidance for the Ummah till the end of time.

Second, the premise that whatever occurred in the Banī Isrā'īl is bound to occur in this Ummah is not acceptable in all respects. And therefore the conclusion that he draws from this premise is false. This is because it is based upon a premise which is not as general as it is purported to be. The evidence thereof is that the Banī Isrā'īl killed their prophets but his Ummah did not, despite the efforts of some hypocrites to do so. Likewise they worshipped the calf but no such worship has occurred in this Ummah. The premise is thus not completely general. And the interpolation of the Qur'ān is more deserving of being an exception due to it being excluded via an explicit verse of the Qur'ān, as we have mentioned, even though some hypocrites have tried to distort it under the guise of Shī'ism.

Likewise our Ummah is very different from the Banī Isrā'īl. For in this Ummah there will always remain a group which will remain upon the truth, whom those who oppose them and those who forsake them will not harm them till Judgement Day. Which is why Allah ﷻ will not make an enemy from outside overcome them and eventually annihilate them. Both these aspects are established in authentic narrations from Nabī ﷺ. Indeed he has informed us that there will always remain a group which will be steadfast upon the truth, whoever opposes

1 Sūrah Fuṣṣilat: 42.

them will not harm them, till the Day of Judgement.¹ He has likewise informed us that he asked his Lord that he should not give dominance to an external enemy over his followers and He granted him that. And he asked him not to destroy them with universal famine and He granted him that. And he asked him that their in-house fighting not be very ferocious and He did not accede to that.²

As opposed to the previous nations, for there was not amongst them a group which was steadfast and assisted in adhering to the truth. External enemies were thus made to destroy them, as in the case of the Banī Isrāʾīl whose kingdom did not remain and in whose era al-Quds was ransacked twice.³

Third, if we hypothetically consider that the Qurʾān is not exempted from the generality of the aforementioned narration, then it is the Shīʿah who interpolate the meaning of the Qurʾān coupled with trying to interpolate its words as well. And what we have presented previously is evidence of this. However, they were unable to reach their objective due to Allah ﷻ taking it upon himself to preserve it as is clearly mentioned in the afore cited verse.⁴

1 The reference has passed on p. 556 of this book.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter regarding signs of the hour: sub-chapter regarding the destruction of the Ummah at each other's hands: 3: 2216; *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*: Tribulations: sub-chapter regarding Nabī ﷺ making three prayers for his Ummah: 4/471-472; *Sunan Ibn Mājah*: chapter regarding tribulations: sub-chapter regarding various tribulations that will transpire: 2/303; *Musnad Aḥmad*: 1/175, 181, 3/146, 156, 5/108, 240, 243, 6/396.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/242.

4 At this juncture Doctor Muḥammad Rashād Sālim dictated the following to me: The resemblance between the doings of both the nations is that in the Ummah of Muḥammad ﷺ there have been those who have tried to interpolate the Qurʾān, like the Shīʿah and the Rāfiḍah, or interpret it in ways completely invalid, like the Jahmiyyah. However, the difference is that the outcomes were different; for in the Banī Isrāʾīl, who concealed the actual Torah and preached the interpolated one, interpolation actually took place. Likewise is the case regarding the Injīl of the Christians. As for the Ummah of Muḥammad ﷺ, Allah ﷻ has taken it upon himself to preserve their holy book, the Qurʾān.

The second misconception

The heretic says:

الدليل الثاني أن كيفية جمع القرآن وتأليفه مستلزمة عادة لوقوع التغيير والتحريف فيه، وقد أشار إلي ذلك العلامة المجلسي في مرآة العقول، حيث قال: والعقل يحكم بأنه إذا كان القرآن متفرقا متشبرا عند الناس وتصدي غير المعصوم لجمعه يمتنع أن يكون جمعه كاملا موافقا للواقع.

The second proof is that the manner in which the Qur'ān was compiled and collected necessitates that change and interpolation take place. Al-Majlisī has alluded to this in *Mir'āt al-'Uqūl*, for he says, "And reason demands that if the Qur'ān was scattered amongst the people and an infallible person thereafter takes up the task of compiling it, it is impossible that his compilation be fully successful and in accordance with the actual revelation."¹

Response: This misconception is based upon the Shī'ī perception that the entire Ummah is on error despite its unanimity and, on the other hand, one person who is not even a prophet is correct, as is discernible from his statement "and an infallible person thereafter takes up the task of compiling it". And this is a completely false notion, as has been explained already under the discussion of infallibility. And whatever is based upon falsehood is false.

The manner in which he has framed his argument posits that many of the scholars in the Shī'ī clergy are calumniators who deny crystal clear realities and believe in falsities and nonsensical things. The compilation of the Qur'ān indeed was realised in the most meticulous of ways and the most reliable of them in terms of precision and perfection; for the scribes of revelation were on the one hand writing and the memorises thereof were on the other hand memorising. Over and above that the Ummah in its entirety was repeating the verses of the Qur'ān in its prayers and circles of learning. Whenever any portion of the Qur'ān was revealed they would advance in memorising it, documenting it, learning it,

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 97.

and practicing it. It is therefore impossible for there to have been a letter which was increased or decreased. It is due to this that the Ummah has concurred upon it. And the unanimity of the Ummah is infallible.

Let us thus apply our minds and understand that this claim was not made by any of the sects amongst the Shī'ah besides the Twelvers. The Twelvers talk of the Qur'ān which 'Alī compiled by himself, which is complete and perfect according to them, and deny that which the Muslims have concurred upon. So what should we believe, the Qur'ān or an unknown book, the appearance whereof is based upon a fictitious awaited Mahdī and which was compiled according to them by one individual.

The Shī'ah have produced some verses of this alleged book which cannot possibly be from the word of Allah ﷻ due to the language therein being inferior to the language of an ordinary person, so how can it then be the incapacitating word of the Lord of the universes?

Moreover, the person to whom the Shī'ah attribute the compilation of this alleged book ('Alī) reads the same Qur'ān which is accessible to the Muslims and considers reading it to be an act of worship, but the Shī'ah claim that was due to him doing Taqiyyah. Can Taqiyyah be practiced in a matter of this magnanimity wherefrom will come about the dissolution of Dīn and the misguidance of generations? This is an answer the falsity whereof is clear even through mere observation and experience. It is the decree of Allah ﷻ in order that the reality of this cult be revealed to all the Muslims as long as they live among them with Taqiyyah.

Furthermore, it is a known fact that the compilation of the Qur'ān reached fruition during the era of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq and 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه after the consensus of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. And at the forefront of the scribes was Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī رضي الله عنه; to the extent that the transmissions of most of the popular readings of the Qur'ān return to him, as is conceded by the Shī'ah themselves, as has passed already.¹

¹ See p. 359 of this book.

And in all the transmissions of the Qur'ān which go back to him there is nothing which opposes the present Qur'ān in any way. Over and above that 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is reported to have praised al-Ṣiddīq and Dhū al-Nūrayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا for their efforts and accomplishments with regards to compiling the Qur'ān.¹ Can the light of the sun which is not dimmed by the clouds be denied, or should we accept fables narrated by a fringe minority from the enemies of the Ummah and its Dīn? Can there be any one more devious than the one who calls on his followers to disavow the Book of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and anticipate the emergence of a forged book which “exists” with a fictitious Imām, or with an Imām who went into occultation for now more than a thousand years? And how can evidence be marshalled against humanity by way of such a book when the Shī'ah themselves have no knowledge of it and no access to it? They do not follow but conjecture and they do nothing but surmise!

The third misconception

The heretic says:

إن أكثر العامة وجماعة من الخاصة ذكروا في أقسام الآيات المنسوخة ما نسخت تلاوتها دون حكمها، وما نسخت تلاوتها وحكمها معا، وذكروا للقسمين أمثلة ورووا أخبارا كثيرة ظاهرة بل صريحة في وجود بعض الآيات والكلمات التي ليس لها في القرآن المتداول أثر ولا عين، وإنه كان منه في عصر النبي صلي الله عليه وآله يتلونه الأصحاب وحملوها علي أحد القسمين من غير أن تكون فيها دلالة وإشارة علي ذلك، وحيث إن نسخ التلاوة غير واقع عندنا، فهذه الآيات والكلمات لا بد وأن تكون مما سقط أو أسقطوها من الكتاب جهلا أو عمدا، لا بإذن من الله ورسوله وهو المطلوب.

Most of the commonality (the Ahl al-Sunnah) and some of the elite (Shī'ah) have averred, in the various categories of abrogated verses that in some verses the recitation is abrogated but not the ruling and vice versa, i.e. the ruling is abrogated but not the recitation. They have cited examples for both types and have narrated many clear and emphatic narrations of verses and words which do not feature at all in the current Qur'ān but existed during the era of Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and were read by the Companions. They

¹ See p. 294 of this book.

have considered such verses and words to belong to one of the two types without any explicit or indicative evidence. According to us, the abrogation of recitation is not valid and thus the only possible interpretation of these verses and words is that they fell away or they (the compilers) omitted them either unknowingly or intentionally, but definitely not with the permission of Allah and his Rasūl Allah ﷺ which is crucial.¹

This misconception is raised very often by the contemporary Shī'ī scholars. By raising this misconception they endeavour to impact upon the reader by creating an impression upon him that the verses the recitation whereof is abrogated according to the Ahl al-Sunnah are not unlike the narrations of interpolation according to the Shī'ah. You will barely find a book from the books of this cult but that therein will feature the discussion of this accusation; you will find that they try to justify the fables which appear in their books by using the narrations which talk of abrogation in the legacy of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

There is no doubt as to the fact that their argument in this regard is untenable. This is because abrogation is from Allah سبحانه وتعالى as he states in the Qur'ān:

مَا نَنْسَخْ مِنْ آيَةٍ أَوْ نُنسِهَا نَأْتِ بِخَيْرٍ مِّنْهَا أَوْ مِثْلَهَا

We do not abrogate a verse or cause it to be forgotten except that we bring forth [one] better than it or similar to it.²

However interpolation is from the actions of men, and there is a vast difference between the two. It is for this reason we will find that many of their scholars have adopted this false stance regarding the Qur'ān (of interpolation) due to the implications of their fables, but we will not find one scholar from amongst the Ahl al-Sunnah who adopted it; because abrogation and interpolation are two completely distinct concepts.

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 106.

2 *Sūrah al-Baqarah*: 106.

Rather there is no place whatsoever for this fallacious belief in the dogma of the Muslims. This is clear from the fact that we find mention of the deviance which crept into the Muslims regarding the Qur'ān in issues like the inquisition of the created-increate nature of the Qur'ān and its likes. But the viewpoint that the Qur'ān is interpolated is found nowhere in the legacy of the Muslims. So how can abrogation and interpolation then be considered the same? This is not but outright misguidance and a sinister plot.

The most that the narrations in question indicate is that those verses and words were part of the Qur'ān for a while and were subsequently abrogated and raised during the lifetime of Nabī ﷺ when the system of revelation was still in function. That is why they are discussed under a dedicated topic of Qur'ānic sciences in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. It never occurred to any scholar that they are indicative of interpolation. Conversely, the narrations of interpolation according to the Shī'ah attribute interpolation to the Companions of Nabī ﷺ owing to believing in liars and calumniators who belie categorically established aspects of Dīn, the diffusely transmitted narrations and the testimony of Allah and His Rasūl ﷺ in favour of them.

According to the Ahl al-Sunnah, the Ṣaḥābah were too pious and Allah conscious to have did something like that. And even if we hypothetically accept that they tried to do so, Allah ﷻ would not have given them the ability to successfully accomplish that. Otherwise that would necessitate that he did not live up to His promise which is impossible. Hence it is impossible for interpolation to have occurred even mistakenly at their hands, because it is Allah ﷻ who has promised to preserve the Qur'ān.

Furthermore, in spite of al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī emphatically denying the abrogation of recitation—minus reading and attributing that to all the Shī'ah in order to bolster his false agenda—the Shī'ah themselves have conceded its occurrence. Even if there is some basis to his claim, then too it would only be referring to some of the Contemporary Shī'ah. In which case it implies that they have plunged

deeper into this misguidance than their predecessors. Hereunder is a brief list of some their ancient scholars who have conceded it.

Shaykh al-Ṭabarsī (d. 460 A.H.) acknowledges thus in his book *Majma' al-Bayān*:

ومنها ما يرتفع اللفظ ويثبت الحكم كآية الرجم

And from them are those verses whose recitation has been lifted but their ruling is maintained, like the verse of *Rajm* (stoning the adulterer).¹

Notwithstanding that al-Ṭabarsī was a denier of interpolation, and the scholars of the Shī'ah advance his stance as evidence to prove that their dogma is free of that indictment. Despite that none of their scholars has averred that his affirmation of abrogation is an affirmation of interpolation.

Before him, Shaykh al-Ṭūsī (d. 460 A.H.) says the following in his *al-Tibyān*:

لا يخلو النسخ في القرآن الكريم من أقسام ثلاثة: أحدها نسخ حكمه دون لفظه والثاني ما نسخ لفظه دون حكمه كآية الرجم، فإن وجوب الرجم علي المحصنة لا خلاف فيه، والآية التي كانت متضمنة له منسوخة بلا خلاف، وهي قوله: والشيخ والشيخة إذا زنيا.

Abrogation in the Qur'ān is one of three types:

1. Where the ruling is abrogated but not the wording
2. Where the wording is abrogated but not the ruling, like the verse of *Rajm*; for there is no dispute regarding stoning being compulsory upon a married woman; the verse which entailed this was abrogated without dispute and it reads as follows, *the married man and married woman, if they commit adultery...*²

He also says in another place:

1 *Majma' al-Bayān* 1/180.

2 *Al-Tibyān* 1/13

وقد أنكر قوم جواز نسخ القرآن، وفيما ذكرناه دليل علي بطلان قولهم، وجائت أخبار متضاربة بأنه كانت أشياء في القرآن نسخت تلاوتها.

Some people have denied the possibility of the Qur'ān being abrogated. But in what we have mentioned there is proof of their assertion being false; for there are abundant narrations which state that there were verses in the Qur'ān whose recitation was abrogated.¹

And prior to them, the shaykh of the Shī'ah, al-Murtaḍā (d. 436 A.H.), who was also one of the deniers of interpolation; who was excluded by Ibn Ḥazm from the viewpoint of the Twelver majority; and whose view is used to show that the Shī'ī dogma is free from the blasphemy in question, admits that abrogation of recitation is possible. He states the following in his book *Al-Dharī'ah*:

فصل في جواز نسخ الحكم دون التلاوة، ونسخ التلاوة دونه

Chapter regarding the possibility of the abrogation of the ruling minus the recitation and the abrogation of the recitation minus the ruling.

He then expounds on both types.²

Hence the acknowledgement of the abrogation of recitation is a locus of consensus between both parties.

Finally, part of the plot of the Shī'ah and their cunningness is that you will not come across a contemporary Shī'ī scholar who has written on this topic but that he has outwardly expressed the view that the Shī'ah are free from this preposterous belief by citing the views of al-Murtaḍā, al-Ṭabarsī, and has thereafter tried to attribute it to the Ahl al-Sunnah due to them acknowledging abrogation of recitation. Whereas al-Ṭabarsī and al-Murtaḍā also acknowledged it. But this plot is in place in order to accomplish an objective which they are not brave enough to reveal and that is their belief in this blasphemy.

1 Ibid. 1/394.

2 *Al-Dharī'ah ilā Uṣūl al-Sharī'ah* p. 428-429.

The fourth misconception

The heretic says:

الدليل الرابع أنه كان لأمر المؤمنين قرآنًا مخصوصًا-كذا- مخالف الموجود في الترتيب، وفيه زيادة ليست من الأحاديث القدسية، ولا من التفسير والتأويل

The fourth proof is that Amīr al-Mu'minīn had a special Qur'ān which was very different in its structure to the present one; therein were additions which were not from *Qudsī* narrations¹, exegesis or interpretation.

In response I say: had Amīr al-Mu'minīn had a Muṣḥaf he would have revealed it to the Muslims; for it would not have been permissible for him to keep it concealed. And if for whatever reasons, as they surmise, he was not able to reveal it during the reign of those who preceded him then he was certainly capable of doing so during his rule. And failing to do so is tantamount to misguidance and disbelief. Hence whoever attributes this to Amīr al-Mu'minīn is indeed not from his partisans, but rather from his enemies due to claiming that he concealed the truth owing to fear and cowardice, notwithstanding that he was the Lion of Allah and His Rasūl ﷺ; for concealing the very basis of Dīn constitutes leaving the fold of Islam.

Furthermore, if he did not reveal it during his time then Ḥasan رضي الله عنه could have revealed it when he came into power. But that to which everyone attests, including the Shī'ah, is that 'Alī رضي الله عنه is not recorded to have read in his prayers or passed judgments by way of any other book save the current Qur'ān which we behold. Likewise is reported regarding all the scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt, as has passed already.² This debunks all the claims of the Shī'ah whose beds became restless, eyes sleepless, unity shattered, and affairs alloyed after having realised that the Mighty Book of Islam is completely silent about their anomalous beliefs. Hence they contrived another 'Qur'ān' when they did not find what they wanted

1 Narrations the words and meanings whereof are inspired by Allah to Nabī ﷺ.

2 P. 357, onwards of this book.

in the Book of the Muslims, just as they contrived a fictitious Imām when their deceased Imām passed away without issue.

Even if ‘Alī عليه السلام had a Muṣḥaf of his own which opposed the seminal Muṣḥaf, it is an accepted rule that due to the unanimity of the Ummah being infallible whatever opposes that which the Muslims have unanimously agreed upon is to be discarded. Notwithstanding that Amīr al-Mu’minīn عليه السلام was at the forefront of those who compiled the Qur’ān; he concurred upon it with the rest and sanctioned the stances taken by Abū Bakr and ‘Uthmān عليه السلام. This is well known, as has passed.

Al-Bāqillānī says:

فإن قالوا: فإنما لم يغير ذلك ولم ينكره لأجل التقية. قيل لهم: ومن كان أقوى منه جانباً وهو في بني هاشم مع عظم قدره وشجاعته وامتناع جانبه. هذا غاية الامتناع والباطل

If they say, “The reason why he did not change that or condemn it is that he was practicing Taqiyyah” we will say to them: Was there anyone who was stronger than him considering that he was from the Banū Hāshim and that he was well-respected, valorous, and well-secured. This is indeed impossible and invalid.¹

He then alludes to the contradiction of the Shī‘ah; for on the one hand they say that he was very brave, assertive when establishing the truth, and not silent upon falsehood; but on the hand they make such ludicrous claims. He then states that the reality which Amīr al-Mu’minīn lived during his Khilāfah rebuts even the mere possibility of Taqiyyah:

فأي تقية بعد أن شهر سيفه وقاتل بصفتين ونصب الحرب بينه وبين مخالفيه فيما هو دون تغيير القرآن وتحريفه. هذا مما يعلم بطلانه ويقطع علي استحالة

Is there any room for Taqiyyah when he unsheathed his sword and fought in Siffīn and waged war against those who opposed him in matters which

1 *Nukat al-Intiṣār* p. 108.

were less important than the interpolation of the Qur'ān and its distortion?
This response is thus obviously invalid and utterly impossible.¹

The fifth misconception:

The heretic says:

الخامس: أنه كان لعبد الله بن مسعود مصحف معتبر فيه ما ليس في القرآن الموجود.

‘Abd Allah ibn Mas‘ūd had a reliable Muṣḥaf. And in it was contained that which is not found in the current Qur’ān.

He then gives examples of verses which appeared in the Muṣḥaf of Ibn Mas‘ūd, as their narrations claim. One of the verses he cites is the following:

وكفي الله المؤمنين القتال بعلي بن أبي طالب ورفعنا لك ذكرك بعلي صهرك

Allah was sufficient for the believers in the war through ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.
And we elevated for you your mention through ‘Alī, your son in law.²

In response I say: There is no dispute regarding the fact that some of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ had their own Muṣḥafs wherein they documented what they heard and assimilated from Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. This in no way undermines the status of the seminal Muṣḥaf nor does it in anyway allude to what these people claim. Because what the Muslims united upon is what holds value and not that which some among them might have isolatedly possessed.

The aim behind postulating that the Muṣḥaf of Ibn Mas‘ūd رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was reliable is clear, namely because the mention of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ features therein. However the examples which he presents suggests that they are fabrications and not actual verses from the Muṣḥaf of Ibn Mas‘ūd. For example the verse:

¹ Ibid.

² *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 136.

وَرَفَعْنَا لَكَ ذِكْرَكَ

We raised for you your mention.

This verse is from Sūrah Inshirāḥ which in its entirety is a Makkī Sūrah, as is known. The addition:

وَجَعَلْنَا عَلِيًّا صَهْرَكَ

And we made 'Alī your son in law

reveals their fabrication. This is because Nabī ﷺ only had one son-in-law in Makkah, i.e. Abū al-ʿĀṣ ibn Rabīʿ. They have thus fabricated but not so cleverly due to them being ignorant of history. Furthermore, was it possible for Ibn Masʿūd رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to document that which is against reality and against what he heard from Nabī ﷺ?

Likewise the second example:

وكفي الله المؤمنين القتال بعلي

And Allah was sufficient for the believers in the war through 'Alī.

is also against the text of the Qurʾān and against reality. Because Allah ﷻ has informed us of those by virtue of whom he sufficed for the believers and that is in the verse:

إِذْ جَاءَتْكُمْ جُنُودٌ فَأَرْسَلْنَا عَلَيْهِمْ رِيحًا وَجُنُودًا لَّمْ تَرَوْهَا

When armies came to [attack] you and we sent upon them a wind and armies [of angels] you did not see.¹

1 Sūrah Aḥzāb: 9.

Hence the early scholars have said the following in the interpretation of this verse:

أي بجنود من الملائكة والريح التي بعثها عليهم

i.e. with an army of angels and the storm which he sent over them.¹

As for its contradiction with reality, ‘Alī himself was not sufficient for the believers. And if there were none with Rasūl Allah ﷺ besides ‘Alī he would not succeed in establishing his Dīn, for ‘Alī was of no avail to himself despite having all the armies of the land with him in his war against Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.²

It is for this reason that al-Bāqillānī says:

فأما ادعائهم أن ابن مسعود قرأ وكفى الله المؤمنين القتال بعلي وما أشبه ذلك من الأحاديث فإنه إفك وزور لا يصح

As for their claim that Ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه read (the aforementioned verse) and other similar verses, they are all lies and fabrications.³

And Ibn Ḥazm says:

وأما قولهم: إن مصحف عبد الله بن مسعود رضي الله عنه خلاف مصحفنا فباطل وكذب وإفك، مصحف عبد الله بن مسعود إنما فيه قراءته بلا شك، وقراءته هي قراءة عاصم المشهورة عند جميع أهل الإسلام، في شرق الأرض وغربها

As for their claim that the Muṣḥaf of Ibn Mas‘ūd was at variance with our Muṣḥaf, it is a lie and a fabrication,⁴ for therein is contained his Qirā’ah (recitation), and his Qirā’ah is the acclaimed Qirā’ah of ‘Āṣim which is popular in all parts of the Muslim world, the east and the west.⁵

1 *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 21/148; *Faḥḥ al-Qadīr* 4/272.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/56.

3 *Nukat al-Intiṣār* p. 107; *Rūḥ al-Ma‘ānī* 21/175.

4 Referring to the Christians; their doubts and objections regarding Islam are similar to the doubts and objections of the Shī‘ah.

5 *Al-Faṣl* 2/212.

The sixth misconception

The heretic says:

الدليل السادس أن الموجود غير مشتمل لتمام ما في مصحف أبي المعبر عندنا

The sixth proof is that the current Muṣḥaf does not comprise of everything which was found in the Muṣḥaf of Ubayy which is credible according to us.

Look at the extent of his fanaticism? The Muṣḥaf of Ubayy is credible according to them and not the Muṣḥaf of the Ummah.

What evidence is there to prove that the Muṣḥaf of Ubayy is credible and not the Muṣḥaf of the Ummah? They have no evidence whatsoever, but they insist on discrediting the Qur'ān in which they will never succeed; for there is no other Muṣḥaf besides the current one. Their statements have returned on them with the worst of outcomes.

Although it is true that Ibn Mas'ūd, Ubayy ibn Ka'b, 'Ā'ishah, and Sālim the freed slave of Abū Ḥudhayfah رضي الله عنه each had their personal Muṣḥafs, as is attested to in the reports of both the Sunnīs and the Shī'ah, however, these Muṣḥaf were private ones which were prepared by their possessors for themselves, but not with the intention that the Ummah will adhere to them. It is for this reason that these individual Muṣḥafs cannot be marshalled as evidence against the Ummah; for the other Maṣāḥif beside the Muṣḥaf of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه are not categorical but rather treated as individual personal copies which are not enough to yield evidence.¹

And if something in these Maṣāḥif happen to oppose what is in the Muṣḥaf of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه, it is natural and inadvertent due to them compiling and writing them for themselves. That is why they would write the exegesis of some of the

¹ *Al-Burhān* 1/222.

verses in the very Muṣḥaf due to them having no fear of confusing the two because they were personal copies.

Ibn al-Jazarī mentions:

وربما كانوا يدخلون التفسير في القراءات إيضاحا وبيانا، لأنهم محققون لما تلقوه عن النبي صلي الله عليه وسلم قرأنا فهم آمنون من الالتباس وربما بعضهم يكتبه معه.

At times they would include exegesis of the different readings for clarification and elucidation, because they were confidently sure of what they had assimilated from Rasūl Allah ﷺ as Qur'ān. Hence they were protected from confusion and thus would at times even write it (the exegesis) with it (the verse).¹

And at times they would even document the abrogated verses:

ولذلك نص كثير من العلماء علي أن الحروف التي وردت عن أبي وابن مسعود وغيرهما مما يخالف هذه المصاحف منسوخة... ولاشك أن القرآن نسخ منه وغير فيه في العرصة الأخيرة

Therefore may scholars have opined that the variant readings and dialects which feature in the Maṣāḥif of Ubayy, Ibn Mas'ūd, and others, which oppose the central Muṣḥaf is abrogated; there is no doubt that much of the Qur'ān was abrogated and changed in the last presentation (revision with Jibrīl عليه السلام).²

To reiterate, all of this was because they wrote for themselves, notwithstanding what the Shī'ah have forged and falsely attributed to these Maṣāḥif.³ As for the Qur'ān, the bearers thereof among the Ṣaḥābah handled the task of its compilation based on what the scribes of revelation had documented in the scripts under the

1 Ibn al-Jazarī: *al-Nashr* 1/32; al-Suyūṭī: *al-Itqān* 1/77.

2 Ibid.

3 That is why one of the Types of Qirā'ah, as stated by the scholars, is fabricated Qirā'ah. See *al-Itqān* 1/77.

supervision of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and was settled upon in the last presentation of Jibrīl عليه السلام to Nabī ﷺ. And this is what is in front of us today without any addition or omission. We, therefore, see that no two people have disputed regarding its credibility, not even ‘Alī رضي الله عنه had denied a letter or more of it.¹

The seventh misconception

The heretic says:

السابع أن عثمان لما جمع القرآن ثانيا أسقط بعض الكلمات والآيات

The seventh proof is that when ‘Uthmān compiled the Qur’ān for the second time he omitted some words and verses.²

He goes on to establish evidence for this claim and says:

العلم بمطابقة ما جمعه لتمام المنزل... متوقف علي... عدالة الناسخين والكاتبين أو صدقهم أو العرض علي المصحف الصحيح التمام...

Knowledge of his compilation being in accordance with the entire *Manzil*... depends upon... the uprightness of the scribes and their truthfulness, or the juxtaposition thereof with the complete Muṣḥaf...³

Which according to him is impossible.

Notice that he has based his claim upon the negative viewpoint that the Shī‘ah hold regarding the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم which is against Qur’ān, Sunnah, the consensus of the Ummah and all the incidents and happenings which have been transmitted diffusely.⁴

1 *Al-Nashr* 1/33.

2 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 150.

3 *Ibid.* p. 154.

4 For a refutation of their viewpoint regarding Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم see p. 1021, onwards of this book

Likewise notice that he has considered the misconception of the Shī'ah that 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had a Muṣḥaf which was inherited from him by the subsequent Imāms to be the benchmark for assessing the central Muṣḥaf, which is obviously tenuous, as tenuous as all those narrations and verdicts which he has cited from their books in order to establish this idea.

Moving on, it is a known fact that the entire Qur'ān was already documented during the lifetime of Rasūl Allāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not order but to rewrite that which was already written; and thus we find that he suspended the documentation of the last verse of Sūrah Barā'ah till he found it written despite knowing it and having memorised it.¹ This was because they relied upon both memory and documentation when compiling the Qur'ān and not only on memory, for their intention was to copy precisely that which was written in the presence of Rasūl Allāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and not merely put on paper what they memorised.²

Furthermore, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has informed us in the Qur'ān that it, the Qur'ān, is compiled in *ṣuḥuf* (scriptures) in the verse:

يَتْلُو صُحُفًا مُطَهَّرَةً

(A messenger from Allah) reciting purified scriptures.³

Hence the Qur'ān was documented in scrolls which were scattered. And Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ compiled them in one place. Thereafter it remained secure till eventually 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ ordered that it be replicated and the replicated copies be sent to various cities.⁴

Ibn Taymiyyah, discussing the process of compiling the Qur'ān says the following:

1 *Fath al-Bārī* 9/12-13.

2 Abū Shāmmah: *al-Murshid al-Wajīz* p. 57; *al-Itqān* p. 58.

3 Sūrah al-Bayyinah: 2

4 *Fath al-Bārī* 9/13.

لما كان العام الذي قبض فيه النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم عارضه جبريل بالقرآن مرتين، والعرضة الأخيرة هي قراءة زيد بن ثابت وغيره، وهي التي أمر الخلفاء الراشدون أبو بكر وعمر وعثمان وعلي بكتابتها في المصاحف، وكتبها أبو بكر وعمر في خلافة أبي بكر في صحف أمر زيد بن ثابت بكتابتها، ثم أمر عثمان في خلافته بكتابتها في المصاحف، وإرسالها إلي الأمصار، وجمع الناس عليها باتفاق من الصحابة علي وغيره

In the year wherein Nabī ﷺ passed away Jibrīl عليه السلام presented the Qur'ān to him twice. The last presentation was the Qirā'ah of Zayd ibn Thābit رضي الله عنه and others. It was regarding this Qirā'ah that Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān and 'Alī رضي الله عنه ordered that it be compiled and documented in the Maṣāḥif; Abū Bakr and 'Umar رضي الله عنه had ordered Zayd ibn Thābit رضي الله عنه to document the Qur'ān in a single Muṣḥaf which he did. 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه had then subsequently ordered that it be replicated and documented in various Maṣāḥif and, thereafter, be sent to the various cities. He then made the Ummah concur upon them with the consensus of the Ṣaḥābah, 'Alī رضي الله عنه and those besides him.¹

Hence a person who considers Abū Bakr and 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه to have erred has indeed attributed error to 'Alī and all the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنه. Because it is an undeniable fact that 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه had compiled the Qur'ān with the unanimity of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنه.²

If what the Shī'ah postulate really transpired, it would not have been permissible for anyone to remain silent upon the distortion of the primary text of Islam and its foundational book. And everyone would have been misled including 'Alī رضي الله عنه. Whereas abundant and agreed upon evidence suggests that the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنه would not have remained silent on issues even of lesser importance than this.

They waged war against those who refused to pay Zakāh. And 'Alī and Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه fought over an issue of even lesser importance. Likewise had what the Shī'ah postulate really happened, it would have been documented by the enemies

1 Majmū' Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām 13/395.

2 Al-Murshid al-Wajīz p. 53

of Islam who look for every niche to criticise Islam, but the Shī'ah have isolatedly narrated this fable.

Despite the Shī'ah narrating this fallacious belief they have documented reports which contradict it. For example, Ibn Ṭā'ūs who is one of the leading scholars of the Shī'ah narrates that:

عثمان جمع المصحف برأي مولانا علي بن أبي طالب

‘Uthmān compiled the Qur’ān due to the view of our master ‘Alī.¹

This, due to it being in harmony with the consensus of the Ummah, defies what the Shī'ah have always been claiming across the centuries. This is an acknowledgement on their path, and an acknowledgment of the opponent is much more convincing than the acknowledgement and approval of the likeminded.

The only response the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* was able to muster against this, despite his fervour to establish this erroneous belief, is the following, “It is indeed really strange.”² But the statement is only strange according to him and those who concur with him.

Ibn Abī Dāwūd has narrated with an authentic chain of transmission, as is stated by Ibn Ḥajr, that Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī عليه السلام said the following:

لا تقولوا في عثمان إلا خيراً، فوالله ما فعل ما فعل في المصاحف إلا عن ملاء منا

Do not say regarding ‘Uthmān but good. For indeed he has not done whatever he done in respect to the Maṣāḥif but in our presence.³

Having said all of this, the greatest attestation to the fact that these people are liars is the examples they present to illustrate what ‘Uthmān had omitted. So we

1 Al-Zanjānī: *Tārikh al-Qur’ān* p. 67.

2 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 153.

3 *Fath al-Bārī* 9/18; Ibn Abī Dāwūd: *Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif* p. 19; Abū Shāmmah: *al-Murshid al-Wajīz* p. 53.

find that the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* cites four narrations from four of their books all of which state that ‘Alī ibn Mūsā al-Riḍā said:

لا والله لا يري منكم اثنان في النار أبدا، لا والله ولا واحدا. قال: قلت: أصلحك الله أين هذا من كتاب الله تعالى؟ قال: هو في الرحمن، وهو قوله تبارك وتعالى لا يستل عن ذنبه منكم إنس ولا جان، قال: قلت: ليس فيها منكم؟ قال: بلي، والله إنه لمثبت فيها وأن أول من غير ذلك لابن أروى

“No! By the oath of Allah no two among you will be seen in the fire of Jahannam. No! By Allah not even one.”

He said (the narrator), “I said, May Allah see to your affairs, where is this in the Book of Allah?”

To which he replied, “It is in Sūrah al-Raḥmān and it is the verse: No human from amongst you will be questioned regarding his sin nor any Jinn.”

I retorted that there is no ‘from amongst you’ in the verse?

He said, “Indeed it is established in it, but the first person to omit it was Ibn Arwā.”¹

The other three narrations more or less convey the same. And ‘Uthmān is intended by Ibn Arwā.

This example, which the Shī‘ah present as proof of what ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه had omitted reveals the hidden reality; for indeed at the instance of the revelation of the Qur’ān there were no Shī‘ah, Murji’ah, nor anyone else, but this verse—as they claim—proves that a Shī‘ī will not be asked regarding his sin. This is indeed a very grave claim which has no support of evidence, rather it is contrary to emphatic verses of the Qur’ān and to what is categorically known of the matters of Islam. It also has grave ramifications, for it can invariably lead to exempting oneself from the commandments and dictates of Sharī‘ah and becoming emboldened in committing sins and cataclysmic crimes.

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 157.

Furthermore, their Imām on oath says that none of his Shī'ah will enter the fire of Jahannam. Did he somehow come to know the unseen or did he make a covenant with Allah? They are, in light of this claim, much more extreme than the Jews who say:

وَقَالُوا لَنْ تَمَسَّنَا النَّارُ إِلَّا أَيَّامًا مَّعْدُودَةً

And they say, “Never will the Fire touch us, except for [a few] numbered days.”

Which Allah has refuted by saying:

قُلْ أَتَاخَذْتُمْ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ عَهْدًا فَلَنْ يُخْلِفَ اللَّهُ عَهْدَهُ أَمْ تَقُولُونَ عَلَى اللَّهِ مَا لَا تَعْلَمُونَ. بَلَىٰ مَنْ كَسَبَ سَيِّئَةً وَأَحَاطَتْ بِهِ خَطِيئَتُهُ فَأُولَٰئِكَ أَصْحَابُ النَّارِ هُمْ فِيهَا خَالِدُونَ

Say, “Have you taken a covenant with Allah? For Allah will never break His covenant. Or do you say about Allah that which you do not know?” Yes, [on the contrary], whoever earns evil and his sin has encompassed him – those are the companions of the Fire; they will abide therein eternally.¹

These verses reveal the falsity of all these claims and that the motive behind the claim of interpolation is actualising an anomalous position not supported by the Qur’ān or authentic Sunnah. Furthermore, they also reveal that the forger of this narration is an ignoramus heretic who has no knowledge of the meanings of the Book of Allah; for the verse in question is regarding the evildoers and he assumes that it is regarding the pious and thus applies it to the Shī'ah. He further tries to enforce this erroneous understanding by adding ‘from amongst you’ and justifies this addition by saying that had it not been added, punishment would have fallen away from the entire creation whereas it is only meant to fall away from his Shī'ah, as he alleges. Not realising that another verse mentions:

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 80, 81.

وَلَا يُسَالُّ عَنْ ذُنُوبِهِمُ الْمُجْرِمُونَ

But the criminals, about their sins, will not be asked.¹

The verse is thus regarding the people of crimes and sins. And Ibn ‘Abbās has, therefore, said the following in the interpretation of this verse:

لا يسألهم هل عملتم كذا وكذا، لأنه أعلم بذلك منهم.

They will not be asked, “Did you commit such and such a sin,” because he will have more knowledge of that than themselves.

And Mujāhid has said:

لا يسأل الملائكة عن المجرم، يعرفون بسيماهم

The angels will not ask about the sinner because they will know them from their signs.²

We sum up the answer to this discussion with what Jāhiz has said in refutation of their misconceptions regarding the compilation of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه:

والذي يخطئ عثمان في ذلك فقد خطأ عليا وعبد الرحمن وسعدا والزبير وطلحة وعليه الصحابة. ولو لم يكن ذلك رأي علي لغيره، ولو لم يمكنه التغيير لقال فيه، ولو لم يمكنه في زمن عثمان لأمكنه في زمن نفسه. وكان لا أقل من إظهار الحجة إن لم يملك تحويل الأمة. وكان لا أقل من التجربة إن لم يكن من النجج علي ثقة، بل لم يكن لعثمان في ذلك ما لم يكن لجميع الصحابة وأهل القدم والقدرة. ومع أن الوجه فيما صنعوا واضح، بل لا نجد لما صنعوا وجها غير الإصابة والاحتياط والإشفاق والنظر في العواقب وحسم طعن الطاعن.

ولو لم يكن ما صنعوا لله تعالى فيه رضا لما اجتمع عليه أول هذه الأمة وآخرها، وإن أمرا اجتمعت عليه المعتزلة والشيعة، والخوارج والمرجئة لظاهر الصواب واضح البرهان علي اختلاف أهوائهم.

1 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 78.

2 Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī 27/142-143; Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr 4/294.

فإن قال قائل: هذه الروايف بأسرها تأتي ذلك وتنكره وتطعن فيه وتري تغييره. قلنا: إن الروايف ليست منا بسبيل، لأن من كان أذانه غير أذناننا، وصلاته غير صلاتنا، وطلاقه غير طلاقنا، وعتقه غير عتقنا، وحجته غير حجتنا، وفقهاؤه غير فقهاءنا، وإمامه غير إمامنا، وقراءته غير قراءتنا، وحلاله غير حلالنا، وحرامه غير حرامنا، فلا نحن منه ولا هو منا

Whoever considers ‘Uthmān to have erred in this regard has averred the same regarding ‘Alī, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, Sa’d, Zubayr, Ṭalḥah, and the erudite among the Ṣaḥābah. Had that not been the view of ‘Alī he would have changed it, and if he did not have the capacity to change it he would have at least condemned it. And if it was not possible for him to do so in the era of ‘Uthmān it was certainly possible for him to do so during his reign. The least he could do was establish the evidence even if he would not have succeeded in diverting the Ummah. Likewise the bare minimum he could do was at least try even though he was not confident that he would succeed. Rather the fact of the matter is that just as the other Ṣaḥābah, who were people of prominence and leadership, did not err so did ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه not err. All the more so when the reasons for which they had embarked upon the enterprise are completely clear; for there is no other viable explanation for what they done besides that of: aiming for precision, exercising precaution, fearing evil consequences, looking deeply into potential outcomes, and shutting the prospect criticism of the criticsers.

If in what they had done were not the pleasure of Allah, the early Ummah and its latter would never have united upon it. But the fact that the Mu’tazilah, the Shī’ah, the Khawārij and the Murji’ah have united upon it despite their divergent motives is obviously evidence of its accuracy and overwhelming soundness.

If someone says that the extremist Shī’ah (*Rawāfiḍ*) reject it in its totality, criticise it, and consider it interpolated we shall say: The extremist Shī’ah have nothing to do with our consensus; for those whose Adhān is different from our Adhān, whose ṣalāh is different from our ṣalāh, whose divorce process is different from our process, whose emancipation is variant to ours, whose Ḥajj is not like our Ḥajj, whose scholars and distinct from our scholars, whose Imāms are different from our Imām, whose reading of the

Qur'ān is different than our reading, whose Ḥalāl is not like our Ḥalāl, and whose Ḥarām is not like our Ḥarām; they can never possibly be from us nor can we be from them.¹

The eighth misconception

The heretic says:

الثامن في أخبار كثيرة دالة صريحا علي وقوع النقصان زيادة علي ما مرواها المخالفون

The eighth proof lies in the copious narrations which clearly indicate that omission of other verses has occurred, besides those which have passed, as is narrated by the opposition.²

He thereafter mentions all the narrations which are narrated by the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding the abrogation of recitation. But there is no evidence for them in this argument, as we have previously stated. Those narrations are specifically mentioned in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah under the discussion of abrogation. We will not repeat what we have already presented previously, for the author is repeating the same arguments but in different styles in order to make them reach twelve which is the amount of his Imāms.

He has, however, at this juncture documented a fabricated Sūrah which he claims he came across in the book *Dabistān Madhāhib*³ and did not come across it in any other book. He subsequently says that it is probably the Sūrah of Wilāyah to which some of the scholars of the Shī'ah alluded in their writings. He cites this entire Sūrah, which is characterised by poor expressions, meaningless words, ludicrous

1 Rasā'il al-Jāhiz: *Risālah Fī Ḥujaj al-Nubuwwah* 3/233-234.

2 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 162.

3 A book in the Persian language of Muḥsin Fānī al-Kashmīrī. It has been published a few times in Iran. And the Orientalist Theodor Noldeke has cited this Sūrah from this book in his work *Tārīkh al-Maṣāḥif* 2/102. This Sūrah was published in the French Asian paper in 1842 (p. 431-439) (see: *al-Khuṭūṭ al-'Arīdah* p. 13)

purports, disjointed context and sentences which are not related in anyway. It is merely words of the Qur'ān which have been re-organised very badly. And the subject matter of this Sūrah is what has concerned the Shī'ah most, i.e. the absence of any evidence in the book of Allah for their anomalous beliefs. Hence we find that it makes mention of the emphatic nomination of 'Alī as the Imām and the excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah due to them not obeying the chosen successor. It reads as follows:

يايها الذين آمنوا بالتورين أنزلناهما يتلوان عليكم آياتي. إن الذين يوفون ورسوله في آيات لهم جنات نعيم. والذين كفروا من بعد ما آمنوا بنقضهم ميثاقهم وما عاهدهم الرسول عليه يقدفون في الجحيم. ظلموا أنفسهم وعصوا الوصي الرسول يسقون من حميم. إن الله الذي نور السموات والأرض بما شاء واصطفي من الملائكة وجعل من المؤمنين أولئك في خلقه يفعل الله ما يشاء... إن عليا من المتقين وإنا لنوفيه حقه يوم الدين... فإنه وذريته الصابرون، وإن عدوهم إمام المجرمين... يايها الرسول قد جعلنا لك في أعناق الذين آمنوا عهدا فخذه وكن من الشاكرين بأن عليا قانتا بالليل. يحذر الآخرة ويرجو ثواب ربه. قل هل يستوي الذين ظلموا وهم بعدايي يعلمون. سيجعل الأغلال في أعناقهم وهم علي أعمالهم يندمون

O you who believe in the two lights which I have sent down who recite to you my verses. Verily those who fulfil and his prophet, in verses for them are the gardens of bliss. And those who disbelieve after having believed due to violating their pledge and that upon which the messenger agreed with them will be thrown in the Jahannam. They oppressed themselves and disobeyed the successor, they will be made to drink from Ḥamīm. Verily Allah is the one who has illuminated the heavens and the earth with what he wanted and selected from among the angels and made from the believers those from his creation, he does what he desires... Surely 'Alī is from the pious and we will give him his full share on the Day of Reckoning... For him and his progeny are the patient ones. And their enemy is the leader of the criminals... O prophet we have placed for you in the necks of the believers a pledge so claim it and be thankful of the fact that 'Alī is a worshipper by night. He fears the hereafter and hopes for the reward of his lord. Say are those who oppress equal, whereas they know of my punishment. Shackles will be placed in their necks and they will regret over their actions...¹

1 Ibid. p. 180-181.

This is a passage thereof. It does not require any analyses due to it being meaningless speech and lowly commodity; even the lowest of linguists will not want it to be attributed to him let alone considering it to be from the Book of Allah ﷻ which has incapacitated the experts of language and the masters of eloquence.

Shaykh Yūsuf al-Dajawī has written an analyses of this Sūrah in his book *al-Jawāb al-Munīf fī al-Radd ‘alā Mudda‘ī al-Taḥrīf fī al-Qur’ān al-Sharīf*.¹ The Shī‘ī scholar al-Balāghī has likewise rejected it in his exegesis ‘*Ālā’ al-Raḥmān*.’² The falsity of this Sūrah is more obvious than can be pointed out, there is thus no need to cite what the aforementioned scholars have mentioned; for you will notice that the matter is quite clear even to someone who merely sees its wording. Take for example the sentence:

واصطفى من الملائكة وجعل من المؤمنين أولئك في خلقه

And he selected from among the angels and made from the believers those from his creation.

You will realise that the one who has forged this is a non-Arab who does not know how to express what he intends. What did he choose from the angels? The sentence is incomplete. Probably he meant that he chose from the angels messengers to the successors but was unable to complete the sentence. Likewise, what did he make from the believers? And what is the meaning of ‘them in his creation’?

You will always find that whoever tries to copy the Qur’ān in its style Allah ﷻ defeats him with helplessness and disgraces him before everyone.

1 See: *al-Jawāb al-Munīf* p. 174, onwards.

2 ‘*Ālā’ al-Raḥmān*’ p. 24-25.

The ninth misconception

The heretic says:

إنه تعالى ذكر أسامي أوصيائه وشمائهم في كتبه المباركة السالفة، فلا بد أن يذكرها في كتابه المهيمن عليه

Allah ﷻ makes mention of the names of the successors and their attributes in his previous divine books. Therefore he necessarily would mention them in the Qur'ān which is their guardian.¹

In other words due to there being no mention of them in the Qur'ān, it is indicative of interpolation according to him. He then cites a fair amount of their narrations which state that the mention of their Twelve Imāms has featured in the previously revealed books.²

In response I say: This claim is based upon the premise that the names of the Twelve Imāms were mentioned in the books of the previous Ambiyā', and that is completely false and based upon false. It is a false assertion whose factuality is based upon another false assertion. Is there anyone who will agree that the Imāms were mentioned in the previous books and subsequently agree that they were mentioned in the Qur'ān as well? Here we have before us the scriptures of the previous prophets wherefrom people have pointed out the mention of Nabī ﷺ, but there is no such mention of 'Alī, let alone the other Imāms. Even those who embraced the faith of Islam, none among them is known to have made mention of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in their scriptures.³

The glad tidings of the advent of Rasūl Allah ﷺ definitely features in the previous books. Allah ﷻ says:

الَّذِينَ يَتَّبِعُونَ الرَّسُولَ النَّبِيَّ الْأُمِّيَّ الَّذِي يَجِدُونَهُ مَكْتُوبًا عِنْدَهُمْ فِي التَّوْرَةِ وَالْإِنْجِيلِ

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 184.

2 *Ibid.* p. 184-204.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/46.

Those who follow the Messenger, the unlettered prophet, whom they find written [i.e., mentioned] in what they have of the Torah and the Gospel.¹

Likewise praise for the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ also features in the Tawrāh and the Injīl. Allah سبحانه وتعالى says:

مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ مَعَهُ أَشِدَّاءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَاءُ بَيْنَهُمْ تَرَاهُمْ رُكَّعًا سُجَّدًا يَبْتَغُونَ فَضْلًا
مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَرِضْوَانًا سِيمَاهُمْ فِي وُجُوهِهِمْ مِّنْ أَثَرِ السُّجُودِ ذَلِكَ مَثَلُهُمْ فِي التَّوْرَةِ وَمَثَلُهُمْ فِي
الْإِنْجِيلِ كَرَزَعٍ أُخْرِجَ شُطَاةٌ...

Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah; and those with him are forceful against the disbelievers, merciful among themselves. You see them bowing and prostrating [in prayer], seeking bounty from Allah and [His] pleasure. Their mark [i.e., sign] is on their faces [i.e., foreheads] from the trace of prostration. That is their description in the Torah. And their description in the Gospel is as a plant which produces its offshoots...²

It was obviously difficult for this cult to note that Allah makes mention of the Messenger of guidance and his Companions but makes no mention of their Imāms despite the fact that the Ṣaḥābah according to them were all apostates and that the Imāms hold much higher ranks than the prophets and messengers; what could they say to their followers? They thus invented narrations which state that their Imāms were mentioned in the previous scriptures. But then the question is why not in the Book of Allah? To this they found no answer but to surmise that the Book of Allah is interpolated, which has resulted in the worst of indictments for them.

The tenth misconception

He says:

1 Sūrah al-A'rāf: 157.

2 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 29.

لا إشكال ولا اختلاف بين أهل الإسلام في تطرق اختلافات كثيرة وتغيرات غير محصورة في كلمات القرآن وحروفه بالزيادة والنقصان واستقرار آراء المخالفين علي اختيار سبعة من القراء منهم أو عشرة علي ما بينهم من الاختلاف... واعتنائهم بتوجيه قراءاتهم وإرجاعها إلي الرسول كما زعموا. فيكون القرآن في نفسه وعند نزوله مبني علي الاختلاف وموضوعا علي المغايرة. وحيث إن القرآن لا تغير فيه ولا اختلاف فتكون هذه القراءات هي قراءة غير ما أنزل الله

There is no dispute amongst the Muslims that much change has occurred in the words of the Qur'ān in terms of increase and decrease and that eventually the unanimity of the opposition settled upon seven of their Qurrā' (transmitters of the Qur'ān) or ten, and that also notwithstanding the differences that exist between them, and that they have dedicated themselves to find a plausible explanation for their variant readings and trace their origins back to Nabī ﷺ, as they allege. Based on this, the Qur'ān in and of itself and from the very instance of its revelation is based upon change. But because there exists no changes and difference of readings in the actual Qur'ān it is obvious that these readings are not divinely revealed from Allah.

He follows this up with a set of narrations which commonly state that the Qur'ān is one and is revealed by one being but the differences are due to the narrators. He impugns the integrity of the seven transmitters and asserts that their readings are not worth acceptance because:

أول طبقات القراء هم الذين استبدوا الآراء ولم يبايعوا إمام زمانهم أمير المؤمنين

The first generation of the Qurrā' exclusively held their own views and did not pledge allegiance to the Imām of their time Amīr al-Mu'minīn.¹

This heretic is trying to draw evidence for the divergent readings of the Qur'ān in order to establish the heresy of his cult despite there being no evidence for them therein; for none of them in anyway even allude to what he is alleging. This is because his argument would only hold weight if each of the Qurrā' who

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 210.

differed with the others in the recitation of some verses would be reading on his own accord based on what he felt was plausible. But the narrations and reports clearly indicate that each one of them had taken his particular reading from the readings of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. They also state that each reading was different from the other and that Nabī ﷺ sanctioned all of them and informed that that is how they were revealed.¹ Hence it is clear that all of them were revealed by Allah and thus the difference between them and the fallacious belief of the Shī'ah is completely obvious.

What is unclear to this heretic is the difference between the readings of the Qur'ān and the Qur'ān itself, due to him considering them one on account of his clear ignorance; because the Qur'ān is diffusedly transmitted according to all Muslims unanimously, passed on from one generation to another, whereas the various readings of the Qur'ān are of variant degrees: some are diffusedly transmitted and thus categorical, whilst others are transmitted by limited narrators and yet others anomalous, containing explanatory side notes² and still some completely fabricated.

No one has ever said that the Qur'ān was transmitted by the seven or ten Qurṛā', for every reading is an exclusive school of reading which an Imam from the Imams of Qirā'ah has adopted and is at variance with the others.

In this regard al-Zarkashī states:

واعلم أن القرآن والقراءات حقيقتان متغايرتان، فالقرآن هو الوحي المنزل علي محمد صلي الله عليه وسلم للبيان والإعجاز، والقراءات اختلاف الوحي المذكور في كتبه الحروف أو كيفيتها من تخفيف وتثقيب وغيرهما

Know that the Qur'ān and the readings thereof are two completely different realities: The Qur'ān is the revelation which was revealed to Muḥammad

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* (and its commentary *al-Faṭḥ*) 9/22.

2 *Al-Itqān* p. 77.

ﷺ for propagation and in order to establish its incapacitating miracle, and the variant readings are the various versions of this same revelation in terms of writing the letters and pronouncing them differently, like reading with *Tathqīl* (reading doubled or similar letters as one) or without it, etc.¹

The seven readings (Qirā'ah) are different from the seven Aḥruf² which this Rāfiḍī denies. Although the authenticity of the ḥadīth regarding the seven Aḥruf is well established, he conflates the two.³

Narrations regarding the Qur'ān being revealed upon seven Aḥruf appear in the books of the Shī'ah as well, to the extent that al-Qummī has established a chapter for it in his *al-Khiṣāl*.⁴

A person who carefully reflects over the chains of transmissions through which these readings were conveyed will find that they contain within them those whom the Shī'ah acknowledge like Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī, Ja'far, and those besides them. This has passed already.⁵

The eleventh misconception

The Heretic says:

1 *Al-Burhān* 1/318.

2 There is no dispute in this regard between the scholars. Only simpletons will think that they both one and the same. This is because the first person to compile all seven readings was Abū Bakr ibn Mujāhid during the fourth century. (See: *al-Murshid al-Wajīz* p. 146; *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 13/390; *al-Nashr* 1/24).

3 A ḥadīth of this nature is narrated by Imām al-Bukhārī in the chapter of *Faḍā'il al-Qur'ān* under the sub-heading 'the Qur'ān was revealed upon seven Aḥruf: (*Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* with its commentary *Faṭḥ al-Bārī*) 9/23: ḥadīth no. 4992; It also appears in the following books: *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, chapter regarding the Ṣalāh of travellers, sub-chapter regarding the Qur'ān being revealed upon seven Aḥruf and its meaning: ḥadīth no. 818; *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, chapter of Ṣalāh, sub-chapter regarding the Qur'ān being revealed upon seven Aḥruf: 2/158: ḥadīth no. 1475.

4 *Al-Khiṣāl* p. 358.

5 On p. 359-360 of this book.

الدليل الحادي عشر: في ذكر الأخبار المعتبرة الصريحة في وقوع السقط ودخول النقصان في الموجود من القرآن، وأنه أقل مما نزل إعجازاً علي قلب سيد الإنس والجان، وهي متفرقة في الكتب المعتبرة التي عليها المعول عند الأصحاب.

The eleventh proof is in all those reliable and emphatic narrations regarding omission and decrease occurring in the present Qur'ān; which talk of it being lesser than the revelation which came down upon the heart of the leader of men and jinn as an incapacitating miracle. These narrations are scattered in our reliable books which have been the locus of authenticity according to our scholars.

Thereafter he mentions a fair amount of narrations from their books on the topic.

These narrations which he has used in support of his position do not in any way suggest the interpolation of the Qur'ān upon which the unanimity of the entire Ummah has settled; the Qur'ān whose preservation Allah ﷻ has taken upon Himself, and regarding whose authenticity and soundness abundant and categorical evidence is established. Rather the aforementioned facts attest to the falsity of these narrations which they attribute to their Imams and their unworthiness. These facts prove that their narrations are not authentic and that their books are indeed interpolated and corrupted. The corruption and interpolation therein have both come to the fore by virtue of this erroneous belief and this preposterous fallacy.

The purport of the narrations he has adduced can only be used in substantiation against the Shī'ah, as for against the Muslims, never.

In fact there is an in-house witness, i.e. from among the Shī'ī clergy, who acknowledges that the narrations in this regard are narrated only by extremists and inveterate liars whose transmissions and reports are not worth acceptance. This in-house witness is their scholar al-Balāghī the author of 'Ālā' al-Raḥmān; for he states:

هذا وإن المحدث المعاصر جهد في كتاب فصل الخطاب في جميع الروايات التي استدل بها علي التقيصة. وفي جملة ما أورده من الروايات ما لا يتيسر احتمال صدقها، ومنها ما هو مختلف يؤول به إلي التنافي والتعارض... هذا مع أن القسم الوافر من الروايات ترجع أسانيدہ إلي بضعة أنفار، وقد وصف علماء الرجال كلا منهم إما بأنه ضعيف الحديث فاسد المذهب مجفو الرواية، وإما بأنه مضطرب الحديث والمذهب يعرف حديثه وينكر ويروي عن الضعفاء، وإما بأنه كذاب متهم لا أستحل أن أروي من تفسيره حديثا واحدا، وأنه معروف بالوقف وأشد الناس عداوة للرضا عليه السلام، وإما بأنه كان غالبا كذابا، وإما بأنه ضعيف لا يلتفت إليه ولا يعلو عليه ومن الكذابين، وإما بأنه فاسد الرواية يرمي بالغلو

Having said this, the contemporary scholar of ḥadīth has tried in his book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* to gather all the narrations which suggests omission. However, some of them cannot possibly be true, whilst others eventually lead to contradiction and conflict in their purport... Notwithstanding that the chains of transmission in most of them go back to just a few individuals. And each one of them has been described by the scholars of transmitter biographies as a weak narrator in ḥadīth who holds an incorrect dogma and is distant from the art of narration; or as a narrator of conflicting narrations and an adherent of a confused dogma whose narrations entail both acceptable and reprehensible narrations; or suspected of lying from whom I do not consider it permissible to narrate even one narration of his exegesis; or as infamous for holding the view of *Waqf* (consignment of the knowledge of who is the rightful Imam to Allah) and being an arch enemy of al-Riḍā; or as a weak transmitter who is not worth consideration nor can be trusted and is from the liars; or accused of having an erroneous belief and being an extremist. It is clear that the abundance of such narrations does not help in any way.¹

Likewise, the leading cleric of the Shī'ah in his time Mīrzā Mahdī al-Shīrāzī mentions that their narrations in this regard are anomalous, their chains of transmission are weak and their texts are contradictory. He states:

وأما ما ورد من الأخبار التي ظاهرها وقوع التحريف في بعض الآي فلا يثبت بها ذلك حيث إنها شاذة ضعيفة الأسانيد، فإن كثيرا منها عن السياري الذي ضعفه علماء الرجال كما في الفهرست لشيخ الطائفة، والخلاصة للعلامة، والرجال للنجاشي أنه ضعيف الحديث فاسد المذهب مجفو الرواية

1 Al-Balāghī: *Ālā' al-Rahmān* p. 26.

As for those narrations the apparent meaning of which suggests that interpolation has occurred in some verses of the Qur'ān, they fail to truly establish that due to them being anomalous and weak in their chains of transmission; for many of them are narrated by al-Sayyārī¹ who has been unanimously impugned by all the scholars of transmitter biographies, as is found in *al-Fihrist* of Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifāh; in *al-Khulāṣah* of 'Allāmah and in *al-Rijāl* of al-Najāshī that is he a weak narrator of ḥadīth, deviated in his creed and far from pure transmission.²

He then illustrates the contradiction in their texts he says:

معارضة بعضها مع البعض من وجهين: أحدهما: تعارضها في تعيين الساقط... وثانيهما: ما ورد في روايات من سقوط اسم علي في مواضع كثيرة، مع أن بعض الروايات تدل على أن الله تعالى لم يسم عليا في القرآن

They contradict each other in two ways: first: they contradict each other in terms of specifying what actually was omitted... second: it appears in some narrations that the name of 'Alī fell away in many places, whereas some narrations clearly mention that Allah ﷻ did not mention 'Alī by name in the Qur'ān.³

This is what al-Balāghī and al-Shīrāzī have to say about their transmitters their transmission.

In no way are we in need of the judgements of the Shī'ah, however, we present them in order to illustrate the contradiction in their verdicts and how they themselves

1 The following is mentioned in his biography: Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Sayyār, Abū 'Abd Allah, the scribe from Basrah. He is known as al-Sayyārī. He is weak in ḥadīth, far from transmission thereof and excessively narrates *Marāsīl* (narrations where the link between him and the Imām or the prophet is omitted). See: *al-Fihrist* p. 51; *Rijāl al-Najāshī* p. 62; *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* p. 203. Ibn Ḥajr states that he lived in the latter portion of the third century, see *Lisān al-Mīzān* 1/252.

2 *Al-Ma'ārif al-Jaliyyah* p. 18.

3 Ibid.

realise the absurdity of their views and their invalidity. Also to illustrate how they try to cover up for their dogma and deny this shameful and blasphemous belief which was introduced into their dogma by their early scholars by giving space to it in their canonical works, i.e. the likes of al-Kulaynī, Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, al-Majlisī and their likes.

It is for this reason that we cite their rulings regarding their transmissions.

The Twelfth Misconception

The heretic says:

الدليل الثاني عشر الأخبار الواردة في الموارد المخصوصة من القرآن الدالة علي تغيير بعض الكلمات والآيات والسور بإحدى الصور المتقدمة. وهي كثيرة جدا (يعني حسب أساطيرهم)، حتي قال السيد نعمة الله الجزائري في بعض مؤلفاته كما حكى عنه: أن الأخبار الدالة علي ذلك تزيد علي ألفي حديث، وادعي استفاضتها جماعة كالمفيد والمحقق الداماد والعلامة المجلسي وغيرهم، بل الشيخ أيضا صرح في التبيان بكثرتها، بل ادعي تواترها جماعة ونحن نذكر ما يصدق دعواهم

The twelfth proof is reports contained in specific sources about the Qur'ān which indicate that some words, verses and chapters were distorted in one of the aforementioned ways. These narrations are abundant (i.e. according to their fallacious reports). To the extent that Ni'mat Allāh al-Jazā'irī has averred in some of his works, as is reported from him, that the narrations which are indicative of this are more than two thousand. And a group of scholars like al-Mufīd, al-Muḥaqqiq al-Dāmād, al-'Allāmah al-Majlisī, and others have opined that they are widely transmitted. Rather Shaykh has also emphatically stated in *al-Tibyān* that they are abundant. Instead a group of scholars have concluded that they are categorically established due being diffusely transmitted (*Mutawātir*). Here under I will mention that which will affirm their claims.¹

He then starts to mention whatever appears in their narrations regarding what they claim is the pure and unadulterated Qur'ān. He cites a thousand and sixty

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 251-252.

two examples following the sequence of the chapters of the Qur'ān which covers over a hundred pages. I shall make mention of some of them in order to reveal the actual objectives which they aspire to meet by way of these fabrications.

But before that, I would want to say that their copious narrations in this regard are only binding evidence for the Shī'ah, not for us. Furthermore, this stupendous amount indicates that the Shī'ī creed is an embodiment of lies through and through, and that it is all about plotting against Islam by attacking its foundational source upon which its edifice stands; i.e. the Qur'ān.

Furthermore, this heretic claims that these false reports are well attested to and diffusely transmitted, and yet at the same time there are others who claim that they are rare and anomalous, notwithstanding that both categories are from the acclaimed scholars of the Shī'ah. Is this not evidence of the stark contradiction which exists in this creed and between its scholars?

This grave claim which he considers to be evidence for his purpose is in turn evidence for his disbelief and an indictment with which he has tarnished his people for eternity. When you are bereft of shame then do as you please and there is no sin more heinous than disbelief. By making this claim he intends to distance his people from the Qur'ān. Because their book is still with the fictitious Mahdī who is in everlasting seclusion and perpetual occultation due to him not being born.

As for the examples that he has presented, they are a poor attempt to ground their beliefs in the Book of Allah and to convince their confused and sceptical followers who were appalled by the fact that the seminal book of Islam does not contain any mention of the Wilāyah of the Twelve Imāms despite it being all of Dīn according to them. Hereunder is some of what this heretic has said:

سورة البقرة: ... عن جابر الجعفي عن أبي عبد الله في قول الله عز وجل: وإذا قيل لهم بما أنزل الله (في علي) قالوا نؤمن بما أنزل علينا

1. Jābir al-Ju'fī narrates the following from Abū 'Abd Allāh: And when it is said to them “Belief in what Allāh has revealed (regarding ‘Alī)” they say we believe in what was revealed upon us.¹

As you can see, they added ‘regarding ‘Alī’ to the verse, failing to realise that the verse is regarding the Banū Isrā’īl and that the context does not allow for such an addition. This is because the very wording of the verse refutes their claim; for the words ‘we believe in what was revealed upon us’ is emphatic that the verse is not regarding this Ummah. But sadly these forgers were either non-Arab heretics who did not understand the meanings of the verses, or probably this is something they intended to do in order to misguide the Shī‘ah and divert them to the ways of disbelief and heresy.

سورة الأنعام: روي الكليني عن أبي عبد الله: إن الذين فارقوا أمير المؤمنين وصاروا أحزابا

2. Sūrah al-An‘ām: al-Kulaynī narrates the following from Abū 'Abd Allāh: verily those who parted from Amīr al-Mu'minīn and diversified into various groups...²

This was an attempt to change the verse:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ فَرَّقُوا دِينَهُمْ وَكَانُوا شِيعًا لَسْتَ مِنْهُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ

Indeed, those who have divided their religion and become sects – you, [O Muhammad], are not [associated] with them in anything.³

Sadly they did not know how to forge this verse; for the verse is Makkī (revealed before migration), and during the lifetime of Nabī

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 254.

2 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 262.

3 Sūrah al-An‘ām: 159.

صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ no Amīr al-Mu'minīn existed due to everyone being his followers and not the followers of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ which would result in parting from him.

سورة البراءة: روي الكليني والعباشي عن أبي الحسن الرضا أن الحسين بن الجهم قال له: إنهم يحتجون علينا بقول الله ثاني اثنين إذ هما في الغار. قال: وما لهم ذلك، لقد قال الله فَأَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ سَكِينَتَهُ عَلَيَّ رَسُولَهُ... وما ذكره فيها بخير قال: قلت له وهكذا قراءتها؟ قال: هكذا قراءتها. وعن أبي جعفر مثله، وقال: ألا تري أن السكينة إنما نزلت علي رسول الله وجعل كلمة الذين كفروا السفلى، وهو كلام الذي تكلم به عتيق (يعني أبا بكر).

3. Sūrah Barā'ah: al-Kulaynī and al-'Ayyāshī narrate from Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā that Ḥusayn ibn Jahm said the following to him: they marshal as evidence against us the following verse: 'the second of the two when they were in the cave'. He replied, "There is no evidence for them therein, for indeed Allah says: 'And Allah sent down His tranquillity upon his prophet'. He has not made any praiseworthy mention of him (Abū Bakr)." I asked, "Is this how the verse should be read?" "This is how it ought to be read," he replied.

A similar narration is narrated from Abū Ja'far, but he also adds the following, "Do you not see that tranquillity only descended upon His Messenger and he made the word of those who disbelieved the lowest, referring to what 'Atīq had said (i.e. Abū Bakr)."

Thereafter commenting upon the narration the heretic says, "This verse is proof of the Companion not being a believer."¹

As you might have noticed, they have tried to distort the following verse:

فَأَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ سَكِينَتَهُ عَلَيْهِ

And Allah sent down His tranquillity upon him.²

1 Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 266.

2 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 40.

They have tried to do so by replacing ‘upon him’ with ‘upon his prophet’. And the purpose thereof is to prove the disbelief of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه by distorting the verse which spells out his greatest virtue. But they did not realise that this change does not really accomplish their purpose.¹

From these examples it is clear that their distortions and fables revolve around the orbit of Wilāyah and the excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah. Most of the fables that this heretic has cited read along similar lines.

After having raised these twelve misconceptions² he endeavours to rebut the claims of the other party of the Shī‘ah which refused to acknowledge this fallacious belief due to its falsity being absolutely clear. He has thus established a chapter in his book for this. And therein he presents their proofs and tries to answer them.

Hereunder I will cite the proofs of the deniers, present the answers proposed by this heretic and analyse his answers.

In reality, in this chapter that he has established he has undone all his previous allegations and assertions. Because he was unable to provide satisfactory answers to the opponents of his blasphemous belief, as you will see.

1 Ibn Kathīr says the following under this verse, “Allah sent down his tranquillity upon him, i.e. upon Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم according to the popular of the two views (*Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr*: 2/384). And another view is: ‘upon Abū Bakr’, this is the view of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, Ibn ‘Abbās and Ḥabīb ibn Abī Thābit (*Zād al-Masīr* 3/41).

2 To read an extensive refutation of the fallacies of the Shī‘ah on this topic the reader can refer to *al-Intiṣār* of al-Bāqillānī (the first vol. in manuscript form is available at the institution for Arabic manuscripts in Cairo; It consists of three hundred and four pages). Likewise to *Nukat al-Intiṣār li Naql al-Qur’ān* of Muḥammad Zaghlūl. The misconceptions that he has raised are not new, for his heretic predecessors also raised them in their times. And the scholars of the Muslims rebutted them accordingly. It seems as though this heretic has retrieved these misconceptions from the writings of some Muslim scholars who documented them without rebutting them. He has done so in order to misguide his people (contrast his misconceptions with those which feature in *al-Intiṣār* of al-Bāqillānī).

The heretic says:

الباب الثاني في ذكر أدلة القائلين بعدم تطرق التغيير مطلقا في كتاب الله تعالى، وإن الموجود هو تمام ما أنزل علي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم... وهي أمور عديدة

The second chapter: making mention of the proofs of those who claim that no change has ever occurred in the Qur'ān and that the current Qur'ān is exactly that which was revealed upon Muḥammad ﷺ These are few in number:

No. 1: the verse:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ

Indeed, it is we who sent down the message [i.e., the Qur'ān], and indeed, we will be its guardian.¹

The heretic says:

واعترض بأن المراد الحفظ من تطرق شبه المعاندين، حيث لا يوجد فيه بحمد الله مدخل إلي القدح فيه

The objection against this is that the verse means safeguarding against the prospect doubts of the opposition; for, by the grace of Allah there is no niche for anyone to target the Qur'ān from that avenue.²

Look at this foolish objection levelled by him; he considers the view of interpolation not to be part of the doubts of the oppositions and thus considers it not part of the broad promise of preservation.

The closest meaning of 'preservation' is preservation against change and distortion. The verse is thus general despite the uneasiness of the disbelievers.

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9.

2 Faṣl al-Khiṭāb p. 360.

He further says:

واعترض أيضا بأن الضمير في قوله له راجع إلي النبي صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم لا إلي القرآن فلا شاهد فيه

The pronoun in 'له' refers to Nabī ﷺ and not to the Qur'ān. There is thus no evidence in the verse.¹

Whereas it is completely clear that it is referring to *al-Dhikr* (message), for the pronoun in the Arabic language refers back to the closest noun. This is also clear from the context of the verse.² Furthermore, is it behaving of Allah to safeguard his Prophet but not his Book. What is wrong with these people? They fail to understand anything at all.

He also says:

ولو سلم شموله للحفظ من التغيير أيضا فإنما هو القرآن في الجملة، لا لكل فرد. فإن ذلك واقع، بل ربما مزق كما صنع الوليد وغيره

Even if, for arguments sake, the verse is taken as comprehensive of preservation from change³, it still refers to the Qur'ān being preserved as a whole. It does not refer to every copy being preserved, for change has definitely occurred (in some of them). Instead at times it was also torn apart like in the case of what al-Walīd and others had done.⁴

This is an ignorant claim which claims that one copy of the Qur'ān getting burnt entails its interpolation. One of their scholars who denies this blasphemy comments thus:

1 Ibid.

2 *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 2/592.

3 i.e. and not considered to only be preserved against the doubts of the opposition, as is the view of these heretics.

4 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 360.

هذا كلام لم يصدر عن روية، فإن المراد من حيث هو أعني ما أرسل به محمد صلي الله عليه وسلم، لا ما رسم فيه من النسخ، فإن جميعها يؤول إلي التلف وهو في الصدور، والصحف محفوظة حتي لو فرض ونعوذ بالله تلف كل نسخة علي وجه الأرض... لكان أيضا محفوظا.

This statement was not said with deliberation. Because what is intended is that with which Muḥammad ﷺ was sent, and not that which was documented in the manuscripts; for they will all one day eventually perish, but the Qur’ān will remain preserved in the hearts. To the extent that if we hypothetically envisage the dissipation of each copy on the surface of the earth, the Qur’ān will still remain preserved.¹

No. 2: the verse:

لَا يَأْتِيهِ الْبَاطِلُ مِنْ بَيْنِ يَدَيْهِ وَلَا مِنْ خَلْفِهِ تَنْزِيلٌ مِّنْ حَكِيمٍ حَمِيدٍ

Falsehood cannot approach it from before it or from behind it; [it is] a revelation from a [Lord who is] Wise and Praiseworthy.²

He fumbles when trying to give an answer against this verse. Hence he first says:

إن الحذف والتغيير وإن كان باطلا لكن ليس المراد من الآية

Although omission and change are part of falsehood, but they are not meant in the verse.³

But why wouldn't change be intended when it is the worst form of falsehood? His fanaticism forces him to say the following:

ظاهرها (يعني الآية) أن لا يجوز أن يحصل فيه ما يستلزم بطلانه من تناقض أحكامه أو كذب في إخباراته وقصصه

1 Muḥsin al-Kāzimi; *Sharḥ al-Wāfiyah*. The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* has cited this on page 360 of his book.

2 Sūrah Fuṣṣilat: 42.

3 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 362.

The apparent meaning of the verse is that all that which will necessitate the invalidity of the Qur'ān cannot occur, i.e. contradiction in its rulings or lies in its information and stories.¹

Look at this interpretation, it smacks of either poor intellect or hidden heresy or both together. Since it is obvious that if what he believes (interpolation) were to occur in the Qur'ān than necessarily there would come about contradiction in its rulings and lies in its stories.

He further says:

وأما ثانياً، فإنه منقوض بمنسوخ التلاوة والحكم أو التلاوة فقط

And secondly, the verse is violated by all those verses the recitation and ruling of which were abrogated or those whose recitation only was abrogated.²

This is revisiting the misconception which we already answered. It is as though he is belying Allah ﷻ due to him claiming that abrogation falls part of falsehood which has indeed occurred in the Qur'ān. Can you see how heinous is his crime?

Abrogation is no doubt true due to it being directly from Allah himself. And the scholars of this heretic, the likes of al-Murtaḍā, al-Ṭūsī and al-Ṭabarsī have conceded it.³ It is thus clear that he and those who concur with him from the contemporaries have gone a step further in their extremism, such that was not envisioned by their predecessors.

He goes on to say:

فيكفي في انتفاء الباطل عنه انتفائه من ذلك الفرد المحفوظ عند أهل البيت

1 Ibid.

2 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 362.

3 See p. 1342 of this book.

The absence of falsehood from the individual copy which exists with the Ahl al-Bayt is sufficient for the realisation of this promise.¹

Muse at the viewpoint of these Rawāfiḍ and at how they interpret the verses which speak of Allah ﷻ preserving his book; they interpret them with a non-existent book which exists with their fictitious hidden Mahdī, regarding both the Ummah has not known anything nor seen any trace.

Furthermore, how does its preservation by the Mahdī help in anyway, does it benefit the people in any way; it only gives the benefit of it remaining unadulterated by Allah. Whereas there is no doubt as to the fact that Allah ﷻ preserved the Qurʾān after its revelation in order for it to remain the constitution of the Ummah till the Day of Judgment; there is no meaning or wisdom to its preservation in anything other than that.

No. 3: their abundant narrations regarding the virtues of various Sūrahs of the Qurʾān.²

Al-Ṣadūq says:

وما روي من ثواب قراءة كل سورة من القرآن، وثواب من ختم القرآن كله، وجواز قراءة سورتين في ركعة نافلة، والنهي عن قراءة سورتين في ركعة فريضة تصديق لما قلناه في أمر القرآن، وأن مبلغه ما في أيدي الناس، وكل ما روي من النهي عن قراءة القرآن كله في ليلة واحدة، وأنه لا يجوز أن يختم القرآن في أقل من ثلاثة أيام تصديق لما قلناه

The reward that is mentioned for reciting every Sūrah of the Qurʾān; the reward of completing the entire Qurʾān; the permissibility of reading two Sūrahs in a rakʿah of optional prayer and the impermissibility of doing so in a rakʿah of an obligatory prayer, all attest to what we have opined regarding the Qurʾān and that whatever is accessible to the people is the ultimately the Qurʾān. Likewise, everything that is reported regarding

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 363.

2 *Ibid.*

the prohibition of reading the entire Qur'ān in one night and that it is impermissible to complete the Qur'ān in less than three days also attest to what we have said.¹

No. 4: the diffusely transmitted narrations from Nabī ﷺ and the Imāms wherein they have ordered that their narrations be judged in light of the Qur'ān. It is obvious that judging them in light of the interpolated and distorted version is useless, and judging in light of the preserved version is impossible.²

1 *Al-I'tiqādāt* p. 102; *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 363. He has endeavoured to answer this by averring that the instruction to read the Qur'ān and complete it does not entail it not being interpolated. And in order to support this claim he advances another argument which is based upon falsehood, he says, "It is just like encouraging people to firmly follow the Imām... which is followed by the inability to do so due to the Imām not being able to reveal what is by him due to fear or practicing Taqiyyah," (*Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 363).

This is based upon the viewpoint of the Shī'ah pertaining to occultation, Taqiyyah, and the leadership of the Imām; the refutation of all of which has passed already and that they are against revelation, reason, and whatever is categorically known in Dīn on account of its widespread transmission. Advancing this specific argument at all is a reflection of their anomalous belief having no basis whatsoever in the Book of Allah.

2 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 364. This exposes the contradiction of the Shī'ah to a very great extent. Answering this particular argument posed a great problem for the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*. He thus tried to rebut it but in a way that he conceded some of the truth. He says thus,

هو قرينة على أن الساقط لم يضر بالموجود وتامه من المنزل للإعجاز، فلا مانع من العرض عليه مضافا إلى اختصاص ذلك بآيات الأحكام لعدم دخول نقص على الخلفاء من جهتها.

"This is an indication that the omitted has not impacted upon the present, notwithstanding that both are revealed in order to establish the incapacitating miracle of the Qur'ān. Hence there is no impediment from judging the narrations in light of it (i.e. the present). More so when this juxtaposition is specific to the verses of laws, due to the Khulafā' not being impugned for (trying to adulterate) them." (*Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 364).

This answer, however, does not eliminate the contradiction which still exists between the narrations which command the juxtaposition of the traditions of the Imāms with the Qur'ān on the one hand and the narrations of interpolation on the other. The claim that this is specific to the verses of laws is baseless; because their narrations are general in the directive of all their narrations being judged in light of the Qur'ān; they do not specify the verses of laws.

No. 5: One of the proofs that the opponents of interpolation have advanced is the diffusely transmitted narration wherein the directive is given to firmly hold on to the Book and the Ahl al-Bayt. This is evidence that the Book will be found in every era, for it is not possible that the Ummah be ordered to hold on to something which it is unable to hold on to.¹

No. 6: If any portion of it was omitted, it would no more be reliable for us to return to it.²

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Tibyān* 1/3; *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 364. He has rebutted this proof based on their erroneous belief. For in their narrations the directive of holding firmly to the Ahl al-Bayt features, but despite that the Imām is absent for centuries now. Likewise is the case of the Book. One of their scholars Muḥsin al-Kāẓimī in *Sharḥ al-Wāfiyah* writes the following response:

إن التمسك بهم... ممكن في الغيبة (يعني غيبة منتظرهم) للعلم بهم وبطريقتهم، وهذا بخلاف التمسك بالكتاب فإنه إننا يتحقق بالأخذ به، ولا يمكن إلا بالإطلاع عليه.

Holding on to them (the Ahl al-Bayt) is possible even during the occultation (of the Mahdī) due to having full knowledge of them and their path. Unlike holding on to the Book; for that will only happen when it is practiced upon and that is only possible after having knowledge of it. (*Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 365)

The heretic was not pleased with this answer. In refutation thereof he thus says:

إن العلم بجميع طريقة الإمام في الغيبة لم يدعه أحد من الأعلام

No eminent scholar has ever claimed to have full knowledge of the path of the Imām.

He goes on... The crux of his response is that just as having knowledge of some of the path of the Imām is sufficient, likewise having knowledge of some of the Qur’ān which is preserved is sufficient. (*Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 365). In this way does the Shī‘ī dogma destroys itself.

2 The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* is exposed once again in the response he gives to this proof, He says:

إن هذا لا يقدر لاحتمال كون الظاهر المصروف عن ظاهره من الظواهر الغير المتعلقة -كذا- بالأحكام الشرعية العملية التي أمرنا بالرجوع فيها إلى ظاهر الكتاب.

This does not pose a problem, due to the possibility of the literal which is diverted from its literal purport not being linked to the practical laws of Sharī‘ah in which we are ordered to go with the literal of the book. (*Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 365).

Perhaps he is alluding to the fact that their reference to the Qur’ān is only in the verses of laws, or put another way, they resort to their esoteric interpretations in all the verses of the Qur’ān save the verses of laws, for therein they resort to the literal. He further says:

Continued on next page.....

No. 7: Given the intensive recording procedure and the attention paid, it is highly improbable that something might have been omitted. The honourable commentator of al-Wāfiyah¹ says:

The longevity of time serves as more of a catalyst for the preservation of that for which necks are stretched and is not reported but for a purpose. How can something like the Qur'ān remain hidden when he ﷺ would be overwhelmed by the weight of revelation when it would descend upon him, so much so that if he was mounted on an animal its legs would quiver? Then when that condition would dissipate he would read to them the revelation like a prolific orator or profound poet who is well versed at citing poem after poem and delivering speech after speech which is brimming with wisdom and opportune for the need, especially when there is a known cause and an obvious sign. Nabī ﷺ would convey to them promises and warnings, encouragements and discouragements, new imposing laws, the tales of the previous nations and strange sayings. All of this was anxiously anticipated for by droves of people with hope and at

continued from page 1384

فإن إرشاد الأئمة إلى التمسك بها (يعني آيات الأحكام) وتقريرهم الأصحاب عليه وتمسكهم بها في غير واحد من الموارد كاشف عدم سقوط ما يوجب الإجمال -كذا- في الموجود من آيات الأحكام وغير مناف للسقوط في غيرها

For surely the directive of the Imāms to hold on them (the verses of laws), their approbation of their companions doing so and using them as evidence in more than one source, all reveal the non-omission of all that which could bring about ambiguity in the present verses of laws.

They thus do not contradict the possibility of omission occurring in all else besides them. (Ibid).

Here he is now making his narrations and fables the deciding factor over the Qur'ān, i.e. their directive of referring to the verses of laws will be accepted and all the narrations which emphasise the importance of holding on to the Book will be interpreted in light of them.

In reality, the contradiction is quite clear. For on the one side the directive to hold on to the Book includes all the verses, verses of laws and otherwise, and on the other side the narration of interpolation are just as inclusive and general. And contradiction is evidence of their narrations being unreliable and that they are not upon anything substantial.

1 Muḥammad ibn al-Sayyid Ḥasan al-A'rajī al-ḤusaYnī al-Kāzīmī (d. 1227 A.H.). The author of *Sharḥ al-Wāfiyah* or *al-Maḥṣūl*. The author of *Al-Dharī'ah* says that he saw few copies of it by some of his scholars (*Al-Dharī'ah* 20/ 151).

times with fear. He further ordained upon them to learn the Qur’ān, read it, memorise it, deliberate upon its meanings and promised them Jannah if they done so. He classed its recitation as the greatest of worships and amongst them there were thus those who spent the entire night reading it. He did not only suffice on that, rather he appointed fourteen individuals¹ to document it, memorise it, preserve it study it by him and regularly report to him. All of this was because, it was a miracle for his prophethood, a source of the Shar‘ī rulings, a Book to which the Ummah could have recourse and a witness for the Imāms. To the extent that a group of them completed the entire Qur’ān by him several times.

Its popularity continued to increase, its light to spread and its radiance to rise day by day, year by year, and century by century till eventually it became the greatest of diffusely transmitted matters in its clarity. After knowing this, you will come to learn the secret of what our master al-Murtaḍā said, as quoted from him by our scholar Abū ‘Alī in *al-Majma’*; he says, “Knowledge of the authenticity of the transmission of the Qur’ān is like having knowledge of various cities, major events and great happenings... (He cites the quotation of al-Murtaḍā we have previously cited in this book).²

He goes on to say, “The glorious Qur’ān was not so much that it could not be compiled, nor was it so scattered that it could not be put together. Rather its parable is like a compendium of poetry belonging to a great poet. Therein is contained profound poetry, interesting points of wisdom and rare proverbs; a compendium which is preserved by transmitters, memorisers, and people who quote it in their gatherings and write it in their notebooks. They do all of this so meticulously that even if they were

1 The scribes of Nabī ﷺ are many. A number of scholars have captured their names; Abū Shāmmah has enumerated twenty five name (see: *al-Murshid al-Wajīz* p. 46. Ibn al-Qayyim has enlisted seventeen (see: *Zād al-Ma’ād* 1/117. Probably the largest account given is that of al-Ḥāfiẓ al-‘Irāqī, for he has mentioned forty two scribes of Nabī ﷺ (see: al-Kattānī: *al-Tarātīb al-Idāriyyah* 1/116). And finally, al-Burhān al-Ḥalabī has enumerated forty three in annotations of *al-Shifā’* (see: Ibid. 1/117). Also refer to: al-Ṣabbāgh: *Lamaḥāt fī ‘Ulūm al-Qur’ān* p. 67.

2 On p. 397 and p. 398 of this book.

to miss a verse, aside from an entire poem, they would search for it. And the announcer of the king would announce to its transmitters, memorisers, singers and writers that bring forth to us what you have. Do you think that anything of it can possibly go missing after all of this?

The Qur'ān is greater than the parable we have mentioned. Its transmitters, scribes and memorisers are more, and the interest of people much more immense. Moreover, it has many readers and memorisers; in the time of Rasūl Allah ﷺ already a group had collected it, hence al-Qurṭubī says that seventy among them were martyred in the Battle of Yamāmah, and yet another seventy during the era of Nabī ﷺ in the incident of the well of Ma'unah. And al-Bukhārī narrates from Qatādah the following, "I asked Anas ibn Mālik regarding those who compiled the Qur'ān in the time of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, He replied, "Four of the Anṣār: Ubayy ibn Ka'b, Mu'adh ibn Jabal, Zayd ibn Thābit, and Abū Zayd." I asked, "Who is Abū Zayd?" he replied, "One of my uncles."

Added to all of this is the immaculate attention given to it by Allah ﷻ himself and the truth of his promise to preserve it and make this religion of which the Qur'ān is the greatest principle reign supreme. So much so that he made the greatest opponents of its supremacy and the least bothered of its high stature from those who strive to preserve it and secure it, just as he preserved the fort of Islam from ruination despite the ardent desire of the enemies to extirpate his progeny.¹

Furthermore, there were abundant stimuli for its propagation for the Muslims, the disbelievers and the hypocrites due to the challenge it poses, its incapacitating miracle, its entailment of primary laws; due to its recitation, its studying and teaching for them and their children; due to it being completed in the month of Ramaḍān, once every month, every seven days, three days, in a day, or reading a portion of it every night; due to its preservation, the nobility of bearing it, and contemplating over its meanings, its proverbs, its promises and warnings. These are some among the innumerable stimuli for its preservation, notwithstanding the great

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 365-367.

number of Muslims and their supremacy, for in the Battle of Tabūk the army of Islam consisted of thirty thousand soldiers and in the farewell Ḥajj seventy thousand had converged.¹

The author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* was really perturbed when quoting these words from the opponents of interpolation from amongst his ranks. He comments thus subsequently:

انتهي ما أوردنا نقله من الكلمات التي تشبه بكلام من لا عهد له بمباحث الإمامة، وحال أصحاب النبي صلي الله عليه وآله في الضلالة والغواية في حياته وبعد وفاته.

This is the end of the quotation we have cited, which is very much like the arguments of those who have no knowledge of the discussion of Imāmah and the condition of the Companions of Nabī ﷺ in their deviation and misguidance during his lifetime and after his demise.²

Nonetheless, a number of their scholars have made similar remarks in rebutting this blasphemy due to its falsity being clear. Hence we find that al-Ālūsī has made the following remarks after citing al-Ṭabarsī's refutation thereof:

وهو كلام دعاه إليه ظهور فساد مذهب أصحابه حتي للأطفال. والحمد لله علي أن ظهر الحق وكفي الله المؤمنين القتال.

He was driven to make such a statement due to the viewpoint of his fellow companions being clearly false, even to children. And all praise is due to Allah for having made the truth reign supreme and Allah was sufficient for the believers in battle.³

In conclusion, this book which its author has penned and with which he has targeted the Book of Allah ﷻ has not harmed the Book of Allah ﷻ at all. Rather it has bounced back upon his cult with the worst of ramifications; for

1 *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb* p. 367.

2 Ibid.

3 *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī* 1/24.

it has become the biggest disgrace for the Shī'ah. And it is concrete evidence of the fact that their narrations are unreliable and baseless, and that despite being diffusely transmitted they are not worth consideration. It is for this reason that one of the contemporary Shī'ī scholars made the following remarks:

ما أجاد في تأليفه، ولا وافق الصواب في جمعه، وليته لم يؤلفه، وإن ألفه لم ينشره، وقد صار ضرره أكثر
من نفعه بل لا نفع يتصور من نشره، فإنه جهز السلاح للعدو وهيئه

He did not do well in writing it, nor did he meet the truth in compiling it. If only he did not write it, and if he wrote it, if only he did not publish it. Its harm is more than its benefit, rather there is no hope of any benefit whatsoever in its publication, for he has prepared arms for the opposition.

He further says:

ويقال: إن بعض أعداء الدين وخصماء المذهب حرصه علي تأليف ذلك الكتاب وهو رحمه الله لم يشعر
بذلك الغرض الفاسد وليس هذا الحذر أو النقل ببعيد

And it is said that some of the enemies of Dīn and the opponents of the dogma incited him to write this book and he, may Allah have mercy on him, did not realise the sinister motive hidden therein. This assumption or report is not unlikely.¹

In this way do they want this issue to remain hidden and not open, and its narrations scattered and not collected. Because now its harm has far surpassed its benefit, instead there is no benefit in its propagation and thus it should be imparted and shared clandestinely. **Does this suggest that they have books which are not yet published due to their content being too provocative for the Muslim world and grave effects being too grave, owing to which they remain discreetly disseminated?** This is not far-fetched.²

1 Al-Ṭabaṭabā'ī: *al-Anwār al-Nu'māniyyah* 1/24.

2 Instead it is probably a reality, for you find that some volumes of *Biḥār al-Anwār* are banned from being published due to the directive issued by their seminaries.

The Forth Reaction: Overtly denying this Blasphemy whilst trying to prove it in Deceitful and Discreet Ways at the Same Time.

One of their contemporary scholars has embarked on denying this blasphemy overtly and defending the Book of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. You will, however, discern evil in the slips of his tongue and you will see falsehood discreetly inserted into his speech here and there. The worst of those who have treaded this path is their scholar al-Khūṭī in his *Tafsīr al-Bayān*. He says the following:

إن المشهور بين علماء الشيعة ومحققيهـم بل المتـسالم عليه بينهم هو القول بعدم التحريف

What is popular among the Shīṭī clergy and its research scholars, rather what is unanimously agreed upon by them is the view of non-interpolation.²

But at the same time he authenticates a fair amount of narrations of interpolation. So he says:

إن كثرة الروايات تورث القطع بصدور بعضها عن المعصومين ولا أقل من الإطـمئنان بذلك، وفيها ما روي بطريق معتبر

The abundant narrations necessitate the certainty of some of them emanating from the infallibles. There is no lesser degree than being satisfied with them, for among them there are narrations which are narrated in reliable ways.³

He then analyses all their narrations in this regard and considers all those narrations which speak of the Muṣḥaf of ‘Alī, wherein are additions which are not found in the Book of Allah, to be Qur’ān. Notwithstanding that in these narrations what appears is the names of their Imāms and the fables which speak

1 Abū al-Qāsim al-Mūsawī al-Khūṭī, the present scholar who people treat as their authoritative reference in Iraq and elsewhere.

2 *Al-Bayān* p. 226.

3 Ibid. p. 222

of interpolation; he considers all these narrations to be reliable according to their standards. However, he considers them to be explanatory narrations which have descended from Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, i.e. these additions are exegetical notes in light of which the speech can be interpreted, or they were revealed by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى in order to clarify the purport of the verses.¹

As for their fables which are indicative of interpolation, based on his particular understanding, they are twenty narrations, as acknowledged by him. And what he means by them is all those narrations which speak of the *Ṣaḥābah* رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ interpolating the Qur’ān and distorting it. He presents the following narration as evidence for his claim:

ما عن الكافي والصدوق بإسنادهما عن علي بن سويد قال: كتبت إلي أبي الحسن كتابا-إلي أن ذكر جوابه بتمامه وفيه قوله- عليه السلام-: أوثمنوا علي كتاب الله فحرفوه وبدلوه

Al-Kāfi and *al-Ṣadūq* narrate the following with their chain of transmission from ‘Alī ibn Suwayd, “I wrote a letter to Abū al-Ḥasan” (he cites the answer of Abū al-Ḥasan in its entirety and part of his answer was the following) “They were entrusted with the Book of Allah but they interpolated it and distorted it.”

Hence his stance regarding such narrations is that of acceptance. But he avers that they do not suggest the interpolation of the words of the Qur’ān, rather:

فهي ظاهرة الدلالة علي أن المراد بالتحريف حمل الآيات علي غير معانيها... ولولا هذا التحريف لم تزل حقوق العترة محفوظة وحرمة النبي منهم مرعية، ولما انتهى الأمر إلي ما انتهى إليه من اهتمام حقوقهم وأيذاء النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فيهم.

The obvious meaning of these narrations is that interpolation occurred in meaning, i.e. by taking the verses to mean what they did not. Had this type of interpolation not occurred the rights of the Ahl al-Bayt would still be secure and the sanctity of Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ still regarded. And the matter would

¹ Ibid. p. 223, onwards.

not have reached where it has reached in terms of violating their rights and harassing Nabī ﷺ because of them.¹

So he claims that the Ummah, at the forefront of whom are the Ṣaḥābah, interpreted verses with meanings other than their actual meanings. But he considers the distortions of al-Kulaynī, al-Qummī, and al-‘Ayyāshī of the Qur’ānic verses to be the actual exegesis of the Book of Allah. If this is the state of the greatest Shī‘ī reference of our time and this is his best defence of the Book of Allah, then the condition of the Shī‘ah is really worrying. Whilst adding this poison here and there he does not forget to pacify the anger of his reader, especially when he knows that his particular interpretation seems very far-fetched to those who know their texts and their narrations. He thus says:

وإذا لم يتم هذا الحمل فلا بد من طرح هذه الروايات

If this interpretation is not viable than these narrations have to necessarily be discarded.²

Furthermore, he says the following regarding the fables of omission occurring in the Qur’ān:

أكثر هذه الروايات بل كثيرها ضعيفة السند

Most of these narrations, rather many of them have weak chains of transmission.

He then quotes the following from one of their scholars:

إن نقصان الكتاب مما لا أصل له، وإلا لاشتهر وتواتر نظرا إلى العادة في الحوادث العظيمة وهذا منها بل أعظمها

1 *Al-Bayān* p. 229.

2 *Ibid.* p. 230-231.

Omission occurring in the Qur'ān has no basis whatsoever. Otherwise it would have been well known and diffusely transmitted considering the norm in great events. This is indeed one of them, instead the greatest of them all.¹

He says the following regarding their fables which speak of interpolation occurring in the Qur'ān by way of addition and omission and which suggest that the Ummah changed some words after the demise of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and substituted them with others after presenting a few examples, one of which is:

ما عن العياشي عن هشام بن سالم: قال سألت أبا عبد الله رضي الله عنه عن قوله تعالى: إِنَّ اللَّهَ اصْطَفَىٰ آدَمَ وَنُوحًا وَآلَ إِبْرَاهِيمَ وَآلَ عِمْرَانَ. قال: هو آل إبراهيم وآل محمد على العالمين، فوضعوا اسما مكان اسم، أي أنهم غيروا فجعلوا مكان آل محمد آل عمران.

Al-'Ayyāshī narrates the following from Hishām ibn Sālim, "I asked Abū 'Abd Allah ﷺ regarding the verse: "Certainly Allah chose Ādam, the family of Nūḥ, the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of 'Imrān upon the worlds." He said, "It is actually 'the family of Ibrāhīm and the family of Muḥammad upon the worlds'. But they substituted one name with another, i.e. they changed the verse and place 'the family of 'Imrān' in place of 'the family of Muḥammad'.

He avers that they are against the Qur'ān, the Sunnah, and the unanimity of the Muslims regarding not even a letter being added to the Qur'ān, to the extent that even the proponents of interpolation concur.²

Notice the extent of deceit in his comment; by making this comment on this last set of narrations he is giving the reader the impression that the falsity of all the other types of their fables which were mentioned before is not unanimously agreed upon by the Muslims. Likewise he is considering the viewpoint of the proponents of interpolation worth consideration in the unanimity of the Muslims.

1 Ibid. p. 233.

2 Al-Bayān p. 232-233.

This is merely a pleasant but deceitful covering intended to accomplish a sinister goal. And that is attacking the Book of Allah *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى* in deceitful and secretive ways; it is owing to his cunningness that his book did not cause such eruptions as did the book *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*. In fact some have even considered his work to be a defence of the Qur’ān. However you have seen that he tries to prove their blasphemy using the methods of the Ahl al-Sunnah in very strange and cunning ways. Here is another example, wherein he appears to be defending the Book of Allah *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى*, where he says:

إن القول بنسخ التلاوة هو بعينه القول بالتحريف، وعليه فاشتهار القول بوقوع النسخ في التلاوة عند علماء أهل السنة يستلزم -في زعمه- اشتهاار القول بالتحريف

Holding the view of the abrogation of recitation is itself holding the view of interpolation. And the popularity of the view of abrogation of recitation according to the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah necessitates the popularity of the view of interpolation.¹

He likewise says:

إن الالتزام بصحة هذه الروايات (يعني: روايات نسخ التلاوة) التزام بوقوع التحريف في القرآن

Averring that the narrations of abrogation of recitation are authentic necessitates averring that interpolation has occurred in the Qur’ān.²

He further says:

فيمكن أن يدعى أن القول بالتحريف هو مذهب أكثر علماء أهل السنة لأنهم يقولون بجواز نسخ التلاوة

It is thus okay to claim that the viewpoint of interpolation is the view of the majority of Sunnī scholars due to them holding the view of abrogation of recitation being permissible.³

1 Ibid. p. 201.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid. p. 206.

This deceptive argument which is advanced by the most senior Shī'ī scholar of the present day is nothing new. Some heretics had advanced the same argument in the past and the Ahl al-Sunnah had rebutted it then already.¹

The issue is quite clear, and the difference between abrogation and interpolation is stark and can only be obscure to someone who is blinded by his ego, as has already passed; interpolation is from the doings of man and Allah has censured the one who does it, he says:

يُحَرِّفُونَ الْكَلِمَ عَنْ مَوَاضِعِهِ

Those who distort words from their [proper] places.²

And abrogation is directly from Allah, he says:

مَا نَنْسَخْ مِنْ آيَةٍ أَوْ نُنسِهَا نَأْتِ بِخَيْرٍ مِّنْهَا أَوْ مِثْلَهَا

We do not abrogate a verse or cause it to be forgotten except that we bring forth [one] better than it or similar to it.³

This does not in any way entail tempering with the Book of Allah. The early scholars of the Shī'ah who were opponents of this blasphemy approved it, the likes of al-Ṭabarsī in *Majma' al-Bayān*, al-Murtaḍā in *Al-Dharī'ah* and others, as has passed.

Furthermore, you will come to realise his deception once more when he asserts that:

إن القول بعدم التحريف هو المشهور بل التسالم عليه بين علماء الشيعة ومحققيهـم

1 See al-Bāqillānī: *Nukat al-Intiṣār* p. 103.

2 Sūrah al-Nisā': 46; Sūrah Mā'idah: 13.

3 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 106.

The viewpoint of non-interpolation is famous, rather agreed upon with unanimity by the Shīʿī clergy and its research scholars.¹

And in supporting his claim he cites what al-Ṭabarsī has said in *Majmaʿ al-Bayān* when denying this blasphemy. Al-Ṭabarsī on the other hand himself, just a few pages later, has approved of abrogation of recitation whilst al-Khūʾī on the other hand avers that abrogation of recitation is tantamount to interpolation. Is this not a contradiction?

In fact, he says that the view of non-interpolation is the view of the Shīʿī clergy and its research scholars, but some of the central scholars of the Shīʿī dogma, the likes of al-Kulaynī, al-Qummī, al-Ṭabarsī (the author of *al-Ihtijāj*) and others believed in openly proclaiming this heresy. Is this not deception?

It gets even worse. And that is because their scholar Ibrāhīm al-Qummī has narrated abundant narrations regarding this blasphemy in his *Tafsīr*. And, among other scholars of the Shīʿah, that is what he believed. Al-Kāshānī says:

وأما اعتقاد مشايخنا في ذلك فالظاهر من ثقة الإسلام محمد بن يعقوب الكليني أنه كان يعتقد التحريف والنقصان في القرآن... وكذلك أستاذه علي بن إبراهيم القمي، فإن تفسيره مملو منه وله غلو فيه.

As to the belief of our scholars regarding it, what is apparent regarding Thiqat al-Islām Muḥammad ibn Yaʿqūb al-Kulaynī is that he believed in the interpolation of the Qurʾān and omission occurring therein. Likewise was the view of his teacher ʿAlī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, for his *Tafsīr* is filled with those narrations and he holds an extreme view in it.

He further goes on listing all their scholars who treaded the same path.²

As you can see, al-Kāshānī admits that the *Tafsīr* of al-Qummī is filled with narrations of this blasphemy. In spite of that al-Khūʾī who overtly appears to be

1 *Al-Bayān* p. 200

2 *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi*: the sixth introduction: 1/52.

an opponent is of the view that his *Tafsīr* is authentic; he concludes that all the narrations which appear therein are all well established and transmitted from the infallible Imāms due to them reaching him (al-Qummī) through reliable scholars of the Shī'ah, as he alleges.¹

It is now evident that al-Khū'ī the author of *al-Bayān* had the same goal in mind as that of the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*. However, the latter deployed a more straightforward way whilst the former played the card of deceit and trickery.

1 *Mu'jam Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* (first publication: Najf, 1398 A.H.) 1/63; or third publication: Beirut, 1403 A.H. p. 49. This entire quotation has passed in the introduction.

The Second Angle to the discussion: The Viewpoint of the Contemporaries regarding Interpreting the Book of Allah

Are the contemporary Shī'ah free from the approach of Qur'ānic exegesis which is steeped in esoteric interpretation which was adopted by their early scholars like that of al-Qummī, al-Kulaynī, al-Kāshānī, al-Baḥrānī and their likes, or did they unhesitantly follow in their footsteps?

A person who does a comprehensive study of what the contemporaries have written will find that their mentality is mostly confined to those esoteric interpretations which were suggested by their early scholars, and some of which we have discussed previously. The proof of this is that those ancient esoteric *Tafsīr* hold an unmatched position in authenticity and reliability according to them. And there can be no clearer evidence to this than that of the approbation of al-Khū'ī, the senior most Shī'ī scholar of present, of the transmission chains contained in the *Tafsīr* of al-Qummī.¹ Notwithstanding that his *Tafsīr* has reached the furthest extent of esoteric interpretation; it has rather surpassed it.

Similarly, al-Ṭabaṭabā'ī, one of the prominent scholars of contemporary times, considers the *Tafsīr* of al-'Ayyāshī reliable and trustworthy according to the Shī'ah. And his *Tafsīr* follows the pattern of *Tafsīr al-Qummī* in adopting the extremist esoteric approach which excommunicates the Ṣaḥābah and interprets all the verses of the Qur'ān to mean the Imāms and their opponents. And in his *Tafsīr* the narrations of interpolation are also added.

And like this, all their exegetical works, the approach whereof is extreme, enjoy the authentication of the Shī'ah and their reliance, for example, *Tafsīr al-Burhān*, *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi*, *Mir'āt al-Anwār*, etc.²

Does anything remain after this?

¹ See p. 29 of this book.

² See the quotation of al-Ṭabaṭabā'ī which we have cited in the introduction.

As for the approach of the contemporaries in interpreting the Book of Allah, it takes on two different extremes: the very extreme and radical and the moderate and balanced (in comparison to the radical approach). The signs of extremism have surfaced in many of their interpretations of the verses of the Qur'ān when they interpreted them to mean their anomalous beliefs. Hence one of their contemporary scholars who goes by the name 'Alī Muḥammad Dakhīl whilst discussing the occultation of their awaited Mahdī (whose book according to some Shī'ah writers is the most popular book authored on the issue of occultation) establishes a chapter by the title *The Mahdī in the Qur'ān* and presents in it fifty verses of the Qur'ān which he interprets to mean the Mahdī. He subsequently draws the conclusion that the doctrine of the Mahdī is no different from the other categorically established tenets of Islam, and that denying it is equivalent to denying one of the categorically established aspects of Dīn.¹

In fact the amount of verses which their later scholars interpret to mean the Mahdī has reached a hundred and twenty.² And that also did not satisfy some of them and hence he added by way of an addendum more verses which brought the total to a hundred and thirty two verses.³

Furthermore, their contemporary scholar Muḥammad Riḍā al-Ṭabīsī al-Najafī (d. 1365 A.H.) has interpreted seventy six verses of the Qur'ān to mean their doctrine of *Raj'ah*.⁴ This is an extreme which the early scholars also did not reach; the interpretation of *Raj'ah* started with one verse which Ibn Saba' interpreted.⁵ The matter gradually increased, and we find that their early scholars interpreted some twenty odd verses to mean *Raj'ah*.⁶ Subsequent to that al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī in

1 Dakhīl: *al-Imām al-Mahdī* p. 162.

2 Al-Hāshim al-Baḥrānī: *al-Maḥajjah Fīmā Nazl fī al-Qā'im al-Ḥujjah*.

3 Muḥammad Munīr al-Maylānī: *Mustadrak al-Ḥujjah*.

4 In his book *al-Shī'ah wa al-Raj'ah* which was published in 1385 A.H.

5 *Tārikh al-Ṭabarī* 4/340.

6 Jawwād Tārā: *Dā'irat al-Ma'ārif al-'Alawiyah* p. 256.

the twelfth century interpreted sixty four verses to mean this false doctrine.¹ And finally the last development in this extremism was at the hands of al-Ṭabīsī and other contemporary scholars. Probably there will be further developments.

In *Tafsīr al-Mizān* of their most prominent scholar Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Ṭabaṭabā'ī there are likewise many esoteric interpretations which he has cherry picked from the ancient exegesis books of their scholars. He cites them under the title: 'interpretive discussion'. One of the examples which he has cited and approved is the following from *Tafsīr al-Burhān* under the interpretation of the verse:

ضَرَبَ اللَّهُ مَثَلًا لِلَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا امْرَأَتَ نُوحٍ وَامْرَأَتَ لُوطٍ

God presents an example of those who disbelieved: the wife of Noah and the wife of Lot.²

He says:

الآية مثل ضربه الله لعائشة وحفصة إن تظاهرتا علي رسول الله وأفشتا سره

The parable Allah has mentioned is for 'Ā'ishah and Ḥaḥṣah when they teamed up against Rasūl Allah and divulged his secret.³

Likewise when interpreting the verse:

وَيَبْقَىٰ وَجْهُ رَبِّكَ

And there will remain the Face of your Lord.⁴

1 Al-Ḥurr al-Āmilī: *al-Īqāz min al-Haj'ah bi al-Burhān 'alā al-Raj'ah* p. 72-98.

2 Sūrah al-Taḥrīm: 10.

3 Al-Ṭabaṭabā'ī: *al-Mizān* 19/246.

4 Sūrah al-Raḥmān: 27.

He cites the following narration which they narrate from al-Ṣādiq:

نحن وجه الله

We are the face of Allah.¹

This is how the esoteric approach is perpetuated from past to present; the same method and the same form. And there are many more examples.

However, on the other hand, there is a contemporary approach which is more balanced. And its moderation is due to three aspects: first: the absence of that extremism due to which many verses of the Qur'ān are interpreted to mean Imāmah and whatever is related to it; second: its purity from all suggestions of interpolation, its narrations and reports; third: purity from emphatic excommunication of the greatest people mankind has ever known, i.e. the generation of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.

Examples of this approach are the two *Tafsīrs* of Muḥammad Jawwād al-Mughniyyah: *Tafsīr al-Kāshif* and *al-Tafsīr al-Mubīn*.

Hence you will notice that he praises the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ in the interpretation of the verse:

لِلْفُقَرَاءِ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ الَّذِينَ أُخْرِجُوا مِنْ دِيَارِهِمْ وَأَمْوَالِهِمْ

For the poor emigrants who were expelled from their homes and their properties...²

He thus says:

لا شيء إلا لوقوفهم مع الحق وإعلاء كلمة الإسلام وتضحيتهم في سبيله

1 *Al-Mizān* 19/103

2 *Sūrah al-Ḥaṣhr*: 8

(They were not expelled) not for anything but due to them standing by the truth and uplifting the word of Islam and striving in its path.

يَبْتَغُونَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَرِضْوَانًا وَيَنْصُرُونَ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ

Seeking bounty from Allah and [His] approval and supporting Allah and His Messenger, [there is also a share].

He explains:

إيماننا وقولا وعملا، وبهؤلاء المهاجرين وأمثالهم من الأنصار استقام الإسلام وانتشر في شرق الأرض وغربها، ولا بدع فإن قائدهم محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم ولن تكون الأمة فاسدة وقائدها صالحا

In faith, word and practice. It is by virtue of these emigrants and their likes from the Anṣār that Islam became established and spread to the east of the earth and its west. And this is no surprise, for their commander was Muḥammad ﷺ and the Ummah could not have been otherwise after having such a righteous leader.

وَالَّذِينَ تَبَوَّءُوا الدَّارَ وَالْإِيمَانَ مِن قَبْلِهِمْ .

And [also for] those who were settled in the Home [i.e., al-Madīnah] and [adopted] the faith before them...

He explains:

المراد بالذين: الأنصار، وتبوءوا: سكنوا، والدار: دار الهجرة وهي المدينة، والإيمان مفعول لفعل محذوف أي: وأخلصوا الإيمان، وقد أثنى الله على الأنصار بأنهم: يُجِبُّونَ مَنْ هَاجَرَ إِلَيْهِمْ وَلَا يَجِدُونَ فِي صُدُورِهِمْ حَاجَةً مِّمَّا أُوتُوا وَيُؤْثِرُونَ عَلَىٰ أَنْفُسِهِمْ وَلَوْ كَانَ بِهِمْ خَصَاصَةٌ وَمَنْ يُوقِ شُحَّ نَفْسِهِ فَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ.

The people meant in ‘those’ are the Anṣār, and ‘settled’ means stayed, and ‘home’ refers to Madīnah and ‘faith’ is the object of an implied verb. Allah ﷻ has praised the Anṣār by saying: “They love those who emigrated

to them and find not any want in their breasts of what they [i.e., the emigrants] were given but give [them] preference over themselves, even though they are in privation. And whoever is protected from the stinginess of his soul – it is those who will be the successful.”

والذين جاؤوا من بعدهم...

And those who came after them...

He explains:

جاء في التفسير: أن المراد بالذين جاؤوا من بعد الصحابة التابعون لهم بإحسان أخذًا بقرينة السياق، ومع هذا فإن الثناء يعم ويشمل كل من سار بسيرة الصحابة إلى يوم القيامة.

It appears in the *Tafāsīr* that the people meant by ‘those’ are the ones who came after the Ṣaḥābah and followed in their footsteps meticulously, gaging from the context of the verse. And hence the praise includes all those who follow in their footsteps till the Day of Judgment.¹

When you read this explanation you will never be able to tell that the author is from the Shī‘ah who excommunicate the Companions of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and revile them. As has passed already, the author has some criticisms against some of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ but he has not emphatically excommunicated any of them like the rest of his Shī‘ah friends.

Likewise when interpreting the verse:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ

Indeed, it is We who sent down the message [i.e., the Qur’ān], and indeed, We will be its guardian.²

1 *Al-Tafāsīr al-Mubīn* p. 631; compare this interpretation with the narrations of the Imāms which al-Baḥrānī has compiled at this place, see: *al-Burhān* 4/316-319.

2 *Sūrah al-Hijr*: 9.

He says the following:

المراد بالذكر هنا القرآن الكريم، وضمير له يعود إليه، والمعنى أن القرآن الموجود فعلا بين الدفتين، المؤلف لدي كل الناس. وهو بالذات الذي نزل على محمد صلي الله عليه وسلم بلا تقليص وتطعيم، على العكس من الكتاب المعروف بالتوراة، فإنه غير الذي جاء به موسى عليه السلام، وكذا الكتاب المعروف بالإنجيل فهو غير الذي جاء به عيسى عليه السلام.

What is meant by 'message' is the noble Qur'ān, and the pronoun 'its' refers back to it. The meaning of the verse is that the Qur'ān which is between the two covers and with which all the people are well acquainted is indeed the very Qur'ān which came down upon Muḥammad ﷺ, without any addition and omission. As opposed to the book known as the Torah, for it is other than the book with which Mūsā عليه السلام was sent, and the book Injīl for it is likewise other than the book with which 'Īsā عليه السلام was sent.

We still nonetheless find that he did actually interpret some verses in accordance with the demands of his dogma but not with emphatically being radical and extreme in his interpretation like the others. Hence in his *Tafsīr al-Kāshif* when interpreting the verse:

الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ

Today we have completed for you your religion.¹

He states the following:

معنى الآية أن الله سبحانه أكمل الدين مع هذا اليوم بالنص على علي بالخلافة

The meaning of the verse is that Allah ﷻ completed Dīn in this day by explicitly nominating 'Alī for the succession (of Rasūl Allah).

This somewhat balanced approach is definitely the result of him relying upon *Jam' al-Jawāmi'* of their scholar al-Ṭabarsī, as has been alluded to in the introduction.

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 3.

And al-Ṭabarsī in turn relied upon the exegetical works of the Ahl al-Sunnah, as suggested by Ibn Taymiyyah.¹

There are thus two extremes of the Shīʿī approach to the interpretation of the Qurʾān: one is extreme and the other is somewhat balanced. This is not unlike the previous centuries where there existed exegetical works which were heavily influenced by the esoteric approach like that of the works of al-Qummī, al-ʿAyyāshī, al-Kāshānī, al-Baḥrānī, and others; just as alongside them there existed more balanced works like Ṭūsī's *Tafsīr al-Tibyān* and al-Ṭabarsī's *Majmaʿ al-Bayān* and *Jamʿ al-Jawāmiʿ*.

In their narrations there features a directive which orders them to adopt two variant approaches so that people do not come to learn their actual creed; their Imām says:

إن هذا خير لنا ولكم، ولو اجتمعتم على أمر واحد لصدقكم الناس علينا (أي لعرف الناس المذهب
ولكان أقل لبائنا وبقائكم)

This is best for us and for you. For if you were to unite upon one matter the people would believe you against us (i.e. they will come to know the actual dogma) and that would minimise our existence and your existence.²

When comparing the two approaches you will find that the extreme approach draws all its material stringently from the narrations of the Shīʿah and their reports. As for the balanced approach, you will notice that its bearers have opened their hearts and minds to the exegetical narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah and their reports thereby becoming safe from the extreme taint, either by way of Taqiyyah or due to really being convinced. But you will never find a single Shīʿī exegetical work which purely relies upon their narrations free from the esoteric method of interpretation.

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/246.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/65.

So which of the two approaches really represents the Shī'ī dogma?

Previously I had mentioned that some Shī'ī scholars have endeavoured to uproot the balanced interpretive method by suggesting that it is a product of Taqiyyah.¹

Rather al-Majlisī has emphatically stated that advancing the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah is merely to establish evidence against them. And for this he establishes a chapter by the title 'the twenty eighth chapter: What the commonality (i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah) narrate of the reports of the Rasūl ﷺ, and which of them are authentic according to them (i.e. the Shī'ah), and the prohibition of having recourse to the reports of the opponents'.² In this chapter he makes one exception, and that is for the purposes of establishing evidence against them (the Ahl al-Sunnah) to spread Shī'ism.

Instead, al-Khū'ī, the supreme authority of the Shī'ah in Iraq, considers the exegetical narrations of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم to mean the interpolation of the Qur'ān which appears in their narrations.³

And when Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb suggested that the Qur'ān which ought to have been the uniting factor between us and them, and a catalyst for coming closer to converging, their supreme authorities interpreted the verses of the Qur'ān and diverted them to meanings which were not understood by the Ṣaḥābah from Nabī ﷺ, and to meanings which were not understood by the great scholars of Islam from the generation upon which the Qur'ān descended.⁴ When he mentioned this, one of the scholars of the Shī'ah responded with the following:

إن الشيعة ترى من الكيد للإسلام أن يأخذوا... تفسيرهم للقرآن عن تصدعهم وتعنيهم بالذات أمثال أبي هريرة و سمرة بن جندب... وأنس بن مالك من أتقنوا صناعة التلفيق والدس والكذب والافتراء

1 See p. 263 of this book.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 2/214.

3 You can see a number of their fables which speak of the Ṣaḥābah interpolating the Qur'ān in terms of its interpretation here: *al-Bayān* p. 229.

4 *Al-Khuṭūṭ al-'Arīḍah* p. 10.

The Shī'ah consider it a sinister plot against Islam to imbibe their interpretation of the Qur'ān from those very people whom the Qur'ān attacks and impugns, like Abū Hurayrah, Samurah ibn Jundub, and Anas ibn Mālīk; each of who were dexterous in inventing, shoving in, lying, and fabricating.¹

He attributes this response of his to the Shī'ah. If the reality is that the Shī'ah consider taking their Dīn from the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم to be a sinister plot against Islam then for them is their creed and for us is ours. This is because the ineluctable conclusion of this stance is forsaking Islam altogether.

Does this not then imply that the balanced approach is just another exercise of Taqiyyah?

Muḥammad Jawwād al-Mughniyyah, who is one of those who have adopted the balanced approach, does not acknowledge the existence of an extremist esoteric interpretive notion. He asserts that the Twelvers are the most distant from these innovations and heresies and that their books which are accessible to all clearly attest to this.² Similarly, although Muḥsin al-Amīn acknowledges that they do exist in their books, but he concludes that they are anomalous narrations.³ Similar is the view of al-Khunayzī who has rejected some narrations which appear in their books.⁴

Is not denial of what exists a sign of Taqiyyah? The matter is not just about a few anomalous narrations, as they allege, rather it is about complete exegetical works the specific approach of which is esoteric interpretation; at the forefront of them all is *Tafsīr al-Qummī* which has been approved by their prominent scholars. Likewise, the most authentic of their canonical works like *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* and *Biḥār al-Anwār*, among others, contain complete chapters which are inclusive of tens of narrations which interpret the Qur'ān in the esoteric way. So why the boldness

1 'Abd al-Wāḥid al-Anṣārī: *Aḍwā' 'alā al-Khuṭūṭ al-'Arīḍah* p. 65.

2 *Tafsīr al-Kāshif* 7/104.

3 *Al-Shī'ah bayn al-Ḥaqā'iq wa al-Awhām* p. 419-420.

4 *Al-Da'wah al-Islāmiyyah ilā Waḥdah Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Imāmiyyah* p. 1/178-202.

in denying established realities? Do they think that they are rendering a service to their dogma?

Moreover, this denial is clearly debunked by the approach of a group of their contemporary scholars who still blurt all those heresies. In fact their scholar ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn Sharaf al-Dīn has opined that all these esoteric interpretations of the verses and those which are reported regarding the Imāms are the locus of the acceptance of the Shī‘ah due to being categorically established.¹

1 This was when Mūsā Jār Allah said that:

في كتب الشيعة أبواب في آياته وسور نزلت في الأئمة والشيعة، وفي آيات وسور نزلت في كفر أبي بكر وعمر، وكفر من اتبعهما، والآيات تزيد على المئة بل وفيها سور مستقلة... يذكر ذلك أكبر أمام للشيعة في أقدس كتبها في أصول الكافي

In the books of the Shī‘ah there are chapters wherein are verses and Sūrah’s that came down regarding the Imāms and the Shī‘ah. And there are other verses and chapters which descended regarding the disbelief of Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and those who followed them. These verses are more than a hundred in total, rather they are some dedicated Sūrah’s as well. This is stated by the greatest scholar of the Shī‘ah in their most sacred work *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*. (*Al-Washī‘ah* p. 27. Also see p. 65).

So ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn Sharaf al-Dīn responded thus:

أما ما نزل في فضل الأئمة من أهل البيت وشيعتهم فمسلم بحكم الضرورة من علم التفسير المأثور من السنن، وبحكم ما ثبت في السنة المقدسة من أسباب النزول. وأما نزول شيء من القرآن في كفر فلان وفلان، فإنه مما نبرأ إلى الله منه، والبلاء فيه إنما جاء من بعض غلاة المفوضة. وربما كان في كتبهم فرأه هذا الرجل فرمى البريء بحجر المنيء شأن الجاهل بحقائق الأحوال.

As for what has come down regarding the merits of the Imāms and their Shī‘ah, it is accepted due to the reported traditions of the science of exegesis being categorical and due to their causes of revelation being well established in the Sunnah. And as for parts of the Qur’ān being revealed regarding the disbelief of so and so, and so and so, we exonerate ourselves before Allah from them and the onus in them is upon some of the extremist Mufawwiḍah. Probably all of this was in their books and this gentleman happened to come across it there, whereafter he targeted the innocent with the stone of the guilty, as is always the case with those who are unaware of the reality of matters. (*Ajwibah Masā’il Jār Allah* p. 67).

As you have noticed, this scholar considers all those interpretations of the Qur’ān which mean, according to them, ‘the Imām’ or ‘Imāmah to be unanimously accepted due to them being categorically established. But he deploys Taqiyyah when he negates those interpretations of verses of ‘disbelief’ and ‘disbelievers’ which mean Abū Bakr and ‘Umar according to them, and claims that they are not found in *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*. *continued*

In conclusion, the method of interpretation between the ancient and the recent Shīʿī scholarship is very similar. The only new aspect which the contemporaries have is their approbation of what their early scholars had written, even of what the relatively later scholars like al-Majlisī and others had written. As a result, the contours of interpretation drastically increased thanks to the efforts of the scholars of the Safawid dynasty who exceeded all bounds. However, some of their contemporaries wrote balanced exegetical works following in the footsteps of their early scholars who had done so, and denied the existence of these extreme interpretations. This denial, however, could probably be accepted in the past, as to today when the publication industry is booming it does not really help or benefit in any way. And necessarily it will be interpreted as *Taqiyyah*.

As for them emerging with two different faces, this is something that is well-founded in their dogma so as not to let the people come to learn who they actually are.¹

continued from page 1408

This is without doubt *Taqiyyah*, because he denies that they exist in *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*, whereas they do feature therein, and they represent tens of narrations which interpret the verses of ‘disbelief’ and ‘disbelievers’ with Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنه. (See *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*: chapter: some points and excerpts from the revelations regarding Wilāyah: 1/412.)

But this man intends to deceive the people and deny that which is concrete reality and attribute to the Mufawwiḍah that which not even historians have attributed to them (see: *al-Mufīd: Sharḥ ‘Aqā’id al-Ṣadūq* p. 258 for more details on the beliefs of the Mufawwiḍah). Furthermore this sect no more exists, not its members and not its books, as acknowledged by Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’ (see: *Aṣl al-Shīʿah* p. 38).

¹ *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/65. This has passed already on p. 1405.

Discussion 2: The Sunnah according to the Contemporaries

None of the views of the contemporary Shīrī scholarship has changed regarding any of the issues we discussed under the discussion of the Sunnah. To date, they consider the verdicts of their Twelve Imāms equal to the verdicts of Allah ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ. Their scholar Khomeini says the following:

إن تعاليم الأئمة كتعاليم القرآن يجب تنفيذها واتباعها

The teachings of the Imāms are just like the teachings of the Qur’ān in that they have to be implemented and followed.¹

And Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah says:

قول المعصوم وأمره تماماً كالتنزيل من العزيز العليم وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَىٰ

The verdict of the infallible and in his directives are exactly like revelation from the all mighty the all-knowing; *nor does he speak from [his own] inclination. It is not but a revelation revealed.*^{2,3}

It is as though they have considered these Imāms—among who is the fictitious absent Imām who did not come into existence at all and al-Ḥasan al-‘Askarī whom Ibn al-Jawzī has dubbed a weak narrator in his book *al-Mawḍū‘āt*—to be just like the Messengers of Allah and his Prophets. This is due to their belief that they are infallible and the falsity thereof has already become evident to us in the previous pages.

As to their claim that Rasūl Allah ﷺ concealed a portion of the Sharī‘ah and entrusted ‘Alī with it, this is something they never cease to mention even in their books of prayers, as is documented by their scholar Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’ in his book *Aṣl al-Shī‘ah wa Uṣūluhā*.⁴

1 *Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 13.

2 *Sūrah al-Najm*: 3, 4.

3 Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah: *al-Khumaynī wa al-Dawlah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 59.

4 *Aṣl al-Shī‘ah wa Uṣūluhā* p. 77. I have already cited this on p. 179.

And as to those imaginary books, i.e. the *Jafr* and the *Jāmi'ah*, which features in their books, when Shaykh Mūsā Jār Allāh decried the state of the contemporary Shī'ah for believing in such fantasies, one of the contemporary Shī' scholars Muḥsin al-Amīn, without any shame, responded to him thusly:

إن ضاعت صحيفة الفرائض والجفر والجامعة وما ذكر معها عنده وعند أمثاله (يعني موسى جار الله)
فلم تضيع عند أهلها

If he (Mūsā Jār Allāh) and his likes have lost the *Ṣaḥīfah al-Farā'id*, the *Jafr* and the *Jāmi'ah*, then its rightful recipients have not.¹

In fact among their senior scholars of the present age there are those who boast by mentioning these imaginary treasures, names which carry no reality, and enumerate them very conveniently. They boast over the copiousness of these fantasies and when asked as to where these alleged books are, they respond by saying that they are with the Mahdī. If not for fear of longevity I would have cited their statements in this regard.²

Furthermore, the awaited Mahdī of the Shī'ah, in whose life and occultation they believe, is away now for centuries, owing to which the claim of his occultation has become an indictment upon the Shī'ah and a taint to their reputation which are ever increasing. But despite the fact that he was not born at all, some of these inveterate liars have attributed to him some parchments which we have already discussed and analysed.³

It was expected of the contemporary Shī'ah, especially when they are the ones who raise the banners of building relations and initiate the call for unity with the Ahl al-Sunnah, that they might have at least cleansed their dogma and their followership from the fables of the past. But nothing has happened; they actually

1 *Al-Shī'ah Bayn al-Haqā'iq wa al-Awhām* p. 254.

2 Muḥammad Āṣif al-Muḥsinī: *Shirāt al-Haqq* 3/347; Muḥsin al-Amīn: *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1/154-184.

3 See p. 332. (Add page number)

consider these alleged parchments to be the Sunnah which cannot be overtaken by falsehood.¹

What is even more appalling is that they allege that this fictitious Mahdī is still in contact with some of their scholars up to the present day. This implies a continuity in the narrative of approvals and issuing of flawless Fatwās and directives which in their status are just like revelation, as they allege.

Their scholar Muḥammad Taqī al-Madarrisī says:

لَا نَسْتَعِدُّ - بَلْ هُوَ كَائِنٌ فَعَلًا - وَجُودَ عِلَاقَاتٍ سَرِيَّةٍ بَيْنَ الْإِمَامِ وَبَيْنَ مَرَاجِعِ الشَّيْعَةِ، وَهَذَا هُوَ السِّرُّ الْعَظِيمُ

We do not consider it far-fetched (rather it is a reality) that there be secret relationships between the Imām² and the prominent authorities of the Shī'ah. And this is the biggest secret.³

In spite of their reliance upon these fantasies and their acceptance of the narrations of liars, they are still lost in their deviation of shunning the Sunnah of Nabī ﷺ which was transmitted by his Companions. And that also not because of any evidence, but owing to the lame claim that they refused to acknowledge the emphatic appointment of 'Alī as the Imām. To the extent that one of their authorities of this time says:

إِنْ مَا يَرْوِيهِ مِثْلُ أَبِي هُرَيْرَةَ وَسَمُرَةَ بْنِ جُنْدُبٍ وَعَمْرُو بْنِ الْعَاصِ وَنَظَائِرِهِمْ لَيْسَ لَهُمْ عِنْدَ الْإِمَامَةِ مَقْدَارُ بَعْضَةٍ

Verily that which the likes of Abū Hurayrah, Samurah ibn Jundub, 'Amr ibn al-ʿĀṣ, and others is not worth the wing of a mosquito according to the Imāmiyyah.⁴

Rather one of their contemporaries considers accepting the narrations of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ to be a sinister plot against Islam.⁵

1 Al-Khunayzī: *al-Da'wah al-Islāmiyyah* 2/112.

2 i.e. the absent Imām who is not but a figment of the imagination of the Shī'ah.

3 *Al-Fikr al-Islāmī Muwājahah Ḥaḍāriyyah* p. 305.

4 *Aṣl al-Shī'ah wa Uṣūluḥā* p. 79.

5 See p. 1061. (Add page number)

It is for this reason that one of their contemporaries says:

إن الشيعة لا تعول على تلك الأسانيد (أي أسانيد أهل السنة)، بل لا تعتبرها ولا تعرج في مقام الاستدلال عليها فلا تبالي بها وافقت مذهبها أو خالفته

The Shī'ah do not rely upon those transmission chains (i.e. the transmission chains of the Ahl al-Sunnah), rather they do not see them fit for consideration and being advanced as evidence. And, therefore, they do not bother whether they are in harmony with their dogma or not.¹

He also says:

إن لدى الشيعة أحاديث أخرجوها من طرقهم المعتبرة عندهم و دونوها في كتب لهم مخصوصة وهي كافية لفروع الدين وأصوله، عليها مدار علمهم وعملهم وهي لا سواها الحجة عندهم

The Shī'ah have traditions which they have extracted from their reliable chains of transmissions and documented in their specific books. They are sufficient for the secondary and primary issues of Dīn. Upon them do they rely in their knowledge and practice. And they alone, not anything else, are evidence for the Shī'ah.²

This is the reality of their stance regarding the Sunnah of Nabī ﷺ. And they play a very active role in opposing the Sunnah and raising doubts regarding it. In fact some of their senior scholars have launched very vehement attacks against those Ṣaḥābah who narrated abundant narrations. One such example is the work of 'Abd al-Ḥusayn Sharaf al-Dīn regarding Abū Hurayrah. They likewise impugn and malign the senior ḥadīth scholars of the Ummah and the seminal books of the Muslims in ways not found in any other disbelieving sect, as we will find in *Kitāb al-Ghadīr* of al-Amīnī. The scope of the discussion does not permit citing some excerpts from this nonsense.

1 'Abd Allah al-Sabīṭī: *Taḥṭ Rāyat al-Ḥaqq* p. 146.

2 Ibid. p. 162.

Discussion 3: Consensus of the Ummah according to the contemporaries

There is nothing new in this discussion that we can shed light on. Yes of course with the exception of them trying to fit their dogma into the consensus of the Ummah by deploying deceitful ways due to which a person who is not really aware of their reality can be easily deceived. For example Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah says:

إجماع الصحابة بأن تنفق كلمة الأصحاب جميعاً على حكم شرعي، وقد أوجب السنة والشيعة الأخذ بهذا الإجماع واعتباره أصلاً من أصول الشريعة.

The consensus of the Ṣaḥābah in a manner that they all concur upon a particular Sharī ruling is unanimously accepted by the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah and is considered to be a principle pillar from the pillars of the Sharī'ah.

He then explains that the reason why the Shī'ah accept such a consensus as evidence is due to the Imām being present and concurring with the Ṣaḥābah.¹

Look at this cunningness, for the outcome of his assertion is that the Shī'ah consider the verdict of the infallible Imām to be evidence and not the consensus itself. But he has deployed this obscure way to say this in order to deceive and beguile.² And some people have indeed fallen for the trick.³

1 *Al-Shī'ah Fī al-Mīzān* p. 321.

2 See what has passed under the discussion of Ijmā' on p. 543 and onwards.

3 Like Muḥammad al-Ghazālī. He cites this statement of Mughniyah and thereafter concludes that there is no difference between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah in the principle rulings of Sharī'ah (see: *Lays min al-Islām* p. 79-80).

Discussion 4: Their Belief regarding the Fundamentals of Dīn

When talking of *Tawḥīd al-Rubūbiyyah*, the oneness of Allah ﷻ in terms of him being the nourisher, some of their contemporaries have made such statements in conceding for their Imāms attributes which purely belong to Allah that were not previously reported from their early scholars. One of their scholars ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn al-‘Āmilī, regarding whom they falsely claim that he is one of the *Āyāt* (signs) of Allah, says the following when praising ‘Alī (may Allah purify him from what they attribute to him):

وعنوان قدرته السامية	أبا حسن أنت عين الإله
فهل عندك تعزب من خافية	وأنت المحيط بعلم الغيوب
وعلة أيجادها الباقية	وأنت مدير رحي الكائنات
وإن شئت تسفع بالناصية	لك الأمر إن شئت تنجي غدا

O the father of Ḥasan, you are Allah himself and a manifestation of his great power.

You encompass the knowledge of the unseen. Can any discreet thing then possibly be hidden from you?

You are the one giving motion to the mill of all that happens. And you are the cause of its enduring existence.

For you will be the prerogative tomorrow, if you wish you will grant salvation, and if you want you will grab by the forelock.¹

See how he has made a creation from the creations of Allah the deity himself, and the one who possesses all the divine attributes of maintaining the world and creating it, of giving life and giving death; he is allegedly the administrator of all that happens, the cause of its existence and a manifestation of the divine power; he has all-encompassing knowledge of the unseen and will be the reckoner on

1 *Dīwān al-Ḥusayn* 1/ p. 48. (Under the second category which is exclusive to Arabic literature).

Judgement Day; for him solely will the prerogative on that day and thus the salvation and ruination of the bondsmen will depend upon him.¹

This is no surprise, for it is the natural product of the narrations of al-Kulaynī, al-Qummī, al-Majlisī, and the rest; narrations which take on this very extreme. We have presented some examples of them in the previous chapters.

The Twelvers of today represent in their narrations and via the representation of some of their scholars the Saba'iyyah and the other extremist sects who dieficated 'Alī, regarding who we assumed that they no more existed. But suddenly we come to learn that they are still alive amidst the Twelver dogma, so much so that it can be claimed that 'Saba'iyyah' was the old name and 'Twelver' is the new name due to them sharing the same reality. These words did not emanate from a layman of the Shī'ah or a junior writer, rather it has emanated from one of their Āyāt to whom thousands of people have recourse.

You will likewise find that Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā', also one of their supreme authorities and someone who always calls for unity between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah, saying the following when praising the Imāms:

يا كعبة الله إن حجت لها ال	أملك فعرشه ميقاتها
أنتم مشيئته التي خلقت بها	أشياء بل ذرئت بها ذراتها
أنا في الوري قال لكم أن لم أقل	ما لم تقله في المسيح غلاتها

O the Ka'bah of Allah, when the angels perform the pilgrimage to it they consider the throne of Allah to be their *Mīqāt*.

You are the will of Allah by virtue of which things were created, rather by virtue of which their particles were produced.

1 Another poet actually clearly says that all the divine attributes have converged in 'Alī. he says:

جميع صفات الرب فيه تجمعت	وما اجتمعت إلا لسر وحكمة
--------------------------	--------------------------

All the attributes of the nourisher have converged in him. And they have not converged but owing to a secret and a wisdom. (See: al-Ḥā'irī: *Muqtabas al-Athar* 1/246).

I would be your hater in the world if I do not say regarding you that which the extremist Christians did not say regarding the Messiah.¹

He considers his Imāms the Ka'bah to which the angels perform pilgrimage, and the Throne of Allah the *Mīqāt* wherefrom they start. He considers them to be the will of Allah and His power through which things were created. He has taken a pledge upon himself to say regarding his Imāms what the extremist Christians did not say regarding 'Īsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. Probably by enlisting these attributes he has reached the goal he intended.

This is what one of the supreme authorities of the Shī'ah has to say, an authority that represents them in conferences and who is considered by some of the Ahl al-Sunnah, who are not aware of his reality, to be from the moderate Shī'ah. Owing to this misunderstanding they made him their Imām in the first conference of al-Quds,² i.e. owing to the fact that he is two faced and that the secrets and ways of *Taqiyyah* know no limits for them.

If I were to document everything I came across in this regard I would be giving longevity to the discussion.³ However, I will say that in the poetic material which the poets of the Shī'ah and their writers left behind this extremism is found to an appalling extent. It seems as if the flame of emotion and the spark of enthusiasm overpowers the reigns of *Taqiyyah* and thus the reality comes to the fore without manipulation and deception. Maybe that is why this particular topic requires a dedicated study.

And as with regard to *Tawhīd al-Ulūhiyyah*, the oneness of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى in terms of him being the only deity worthy of worship, the shrines of the Shī'ah and their

1 Muḥammad Bāqir al-Najafī (the compiler): *Dīwān Shu'arā' al-Ḥusayn* (published in Tehran in the year 1374 A.H.) p. 12.

2 See the *al-Azhar* magazine for the first conference of al-Quds: 25/506, 638, 979; *al-Muslimūn* 6/45. Also see the comments of Rashīd Riḍā in the *al-Manār* magazine upon making Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā' the Imām in ṣalāh: 29/628.

3 For more examples see: al-Ḥā'irī: *Muqtabas al-Athar* 1/153-245, 248; Muḥsin al-Amīn: *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 5/219; *Dīwān al-Ḥusayn* of a group of their scholars; 'Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Amīnī: *al-Ghadīr* 7/34-67, etc.

holy sites have become the greatest manifestations of Shirk. And there is no hope of reforming this vice for them, due it being supported by those narrations which are falsely attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt. As opposed to the reality of the Ahl al-Sunnah, for this is considered a deviation according to them and is vehemently opposed in their principle sources. Anyone who visited these sites has witnessed the Shirk which takes place there.

Shaykh Mūsā Jār Allāh, after having visited Iran and Iraq for a few months, concludes that their holy sites and shrines are worshiped.¹

And Shaykh Abū al-Ḥasan al-Nadwī says the following after visiting the shrine of ‘Alī al-Riḍā:

فإذا دخل غريب في مشهد سيدنا علي الرضا لم يشعر إلا وأنه داخل الحرم فهو غاص بالحجيج مدوي
بالبكاء والضجيج، عامر بالرجال والنساء، مزخرف بأفخر الزخارف والزينات. قد تدفقت إليه ثروة
الأثرياء وتبرعات الفقراء

When a stranger enters the shrine of our master ‘Alī al-Riḍā he will not feel but as if he is in the holy Ḥaram. For it is packed with pilgrims, echoing with cries and shouts, filled with men and women and adorned with the most lavish of embellishments and decorations. The wealth of the rich and optional charities of the poor have been emptied into it.²

And the author of *al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah* has stated that they continue to do extreme practices at the graves of the Imāms and circumambulate them. Rather they even perform ṣalāh toward them whilst their backs are facing the Qiblah. They do many other such actions that when compared with the devotions of the idol-worshippers for their idols the latter seems insignificant.³ He then says, “If you are in doubt, then go to some of their sites and have a look for yourself.”⁴

1 *Al-Washī‘ah*: Introduction.

2 Abū al-Ḥasan al-Nadwī: *Min Nahr Kābul ilā Nahr al-Yarmūk* p. 93; the *al-I’tiṣām* magazine: edition no: 3 of the year forty one.

3 *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnay ‘Ashariyyah* p. 300

4 Ibid.

Furthermore, you will find that in his book *‘Aqā’id al-Imāmah* which he compiled in order to elucidate the beliefs of his cult, and which was accepted by the Shī‘ah due to us not finding anyone who criticised it, and which he compiled in order to call people toward Shī‘ism, one of their contemporary scholars Muḥammad al-Muzaḥfar does not hold back in emphasising the belief of the Shī‘ah regarding the shrine of the Imāms. He thus says regarding the shrines of the Imāms that one of the specialities of his cult is the following:

تشييدها وإقامة العمارات الضخمة عليها، ولأجلها يضحون بكل غال ورخيص عن إيمان وطيب نفس

Fortifying them and erecting huge buildings upon them. And because of them they sacrifice every lavish and ordinary thing with faith and with generosity of heart.¹

He then clearly mentions that the reasons for this is:

وصايا الأئمة وحثهم شيعتهم على الزيارة، وترغيبهم فيما لها من الثواب الجزيل عند الله تعالى وباعتبار أن هاتيك القبور من خير المواقع لاستجابة الدعاء والانتقطاع إلى الله تعالى

The emphasised directives of the Imāms and their exhortations to visit their shrines, and their promises of the great rewards contained therein by Allah ﷻ... and due to considering the fact that these graves are the best locations for the acceptance of prayers² and for being devoted to Allah

³ سبحانه وتعالى

1 Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muzaḥfar: *‘Aqā’id al-Imāmah* p. 133.

2 If they really were the best of places and if they really had such great merit, then at least some of that should have appeared in the Qur’ān and the Sunnah and they should have been well established and known; they should not have remained unknown to the Ummah and transmitted only by a bunch of infamous liars who were known for their fabrications against the Ahl al-Bayt. And if there was any truth to any of what they say Nabī ﷺ would not have emphatically prohibited the Ummah from transforming graves into Masjids.

3 Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muzaḥfar: *‘Aqā’id al-Imāmah* p. 133.

He further goes onto mention the etiquettes and actions of the visitations without any shame and fear of openly proclaiming the manifestations of idolatry.¹

Moreover, a group of their scholars till today openly proclaim without any qualms and compunction that Karbalā' is more virtuous than the holy Ka'bah. Here we have one of the senior authorities of the Shī'ah, a scholar who spearheads the movement of calling for unity between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah, claiming that Karbalā' is more virtuous than the Ka'bah which Allah made a source of people sound existence, a place to which people continuously flock, a place of amnesty and a place filled with blessings, as is mentioned in the Qur'ān. Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā' hymns the following poem which is against the text of the Qur'ān and the unanimity of the Muslims:

ومن حديث كربلاء والكعبة*** لكربلاء بان علو الرتبة

Part of the discussion regarding Karbalā' and the Ka'bah is that for Karbalā' higher merit has become evident.

He considers this to be from the categorically established tenets of his dogma due to their narrations and reports attesting to it and he thus says:

أشرف بقاع الأرض بالضرورة

Necessarily the noblest of places on earth.²

The attestation of their narrations to this is more than enough evidence of the fact that all their narrations are lies. And also of the fact that whoever forged them is out of the fold of Islam and that whoever believes in them has parted with the unanimity of the Muslims. What status can Karbalā' have when Allah ﷻ says:

1 Ibid. p. 135-139.

2 Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā': *al-Arḍ wa al-Turbah al-Ḥusayniyyah* p. 55-56.

إِنَّ أَوَّلَ بَيْتٍ وُضِعَ لِلنَّاسِ لَلَّذِي بِبَكَّةَ مُبَارَكًا وَهُدًى لِّلْعَالَمِينَ فِيهِ آيَاتٌ بَيِّنَاتٌ مِّمَّا يُرَاهِمُونَ وَمَنْ دَخَلَهُ كَانَ آمِنًا وَلِلَّهِ عَلَى النَّاسِ حُجُّ الْبَيْتِ حَيْثُ اسْتَطَاعَ إِلَيْهِ سَبِيلًا وَمَنْ كَفَرَ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ غَنِيٌّ عَنِ الْعَالَمِينَ

Indeed, the first House [of worship] established for mankind was that at Bakkah [i.e., Makkah] – blessed and a guidance for the worlds. In it are clear signs [such as] the standing place of Ibrāhīm. And whoever enters it [i.e. the Haram] shall be safe. And [due] to God from the people is a pilgrimage to the House – for whoever is able to find thereto a way. But whoever disbelieves [i.e., refuses] – then indeed, God is free from need of the worlds.¹

Does there remain any room for any other view after this?

أَفَلَا يَتَذَكَّرُونَ الْقُرْآنَ أَمْ عَلَى قُلُوبٍ أَقْفَالُهَا

Then do they not reflect upon the Qur’ān, or are there locks upon [their] hearts?²

In conclusion, the statements of their scholars in this regard are abundant.³

1 Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 96, 97.

2 Sūrah Muḥammad: 24.

3 For example: Mīrzā Ḥusayn al-Ḥā’irī says the following:

كربلاء تلك التربة الطيبة الطاهرة، والأرض المقدسة التي قال في حقها رب السموات والأرضين مخاطباً للكعبة حينما افتخرت على سائر البقاع قري واستقري لو لا أرض كربلاء وما ضمنه لما خلقتك.

Karbalā’ is that pure and sublime soil, and that sanctified land in reference to which the Lord of the heavens and the earths said addressing the Ka’bah when it boasted about itself before all the other pieces of land, “Settle down and calm down, for had it not been for the land of Karbalā’ I would not have created you.”

He further says:

وكذلك أصبحت هذه البقعة المباركة بعد ما صارت مدفناً لإمام رضي الله عنه مزاراً للمسلمين وكعبة للموحدين ومطافاً للملوك والساطين ومسجداً للمصلين

And after having become the resting place of the Imām عليه السلام, like this did this blessed land transform into a holy site for the Muslims, into the Ka’bah for those who believe in the oneness of Allah, a place regularly encircled by the kings and rulers and a masjid for those who pray. (Al-Ḥā’irī: *Aḥkām al-Shī’ah* 1/32). continued . . .

Where on the one hand we find the ancient books of the Shī'ah mentioning that Allah ﷻ forgave the Ambiyā' due to them imploring him through the agency of the Imāms, we on the other hand find that this belief (which is steeped in extremism, which entails according the Imāms superiority over the Ambiyā'¹ and which is the epitome of gullibility and heedlessness due to it presupposing the existence of the Imāms during eras of the previous Ambiyā') is affirmed by some of their senior authorities of the present. Hence 'Abd Allah al-Māmaqānī advises his son with the following advice:

وعليك بني بالتوسل بالنبي وآله صلى الله عليهم أجمعين، فإني قد استقصيت الأخبار فوجدت أنه ما تاب الله على نبي من أنبيائه من الزلة إلا بالتوسل بهم

And, O my son, hold on to praying through the agency of the Nabī and his household, may Allah have mercy on all of them. For after having done an in-depth study of the narrations I found that Allah did not forgive any Nabī from the Ambiyā' for a mistake² but after he prayed through their agency.³

continued from page 1423

And 'Abd al-Jawwād Āl Ṭu'mah avers in his book *Tārīkh Karbalā'* that their narrations have classed Karbalā' as the best piece of land on earth. Hence the Shī'ah consider it to be the chosen, sanctified and blessed land of Allah ﷻ. And according to their standards it is the Ḥaram of Allah and his Rasūl and the Qiblah of the Muslims. In its soil is cure. And it holds such virtues as not found in any other piece of land, not even the Ka'bah. (*Tārīkh Karbalā'* p. 115-116. This book has been authenticated by a number of their scholars; see the introduction of the book for more details).

Similarly their scholar Muḥammad al-Shīrāzī says:

تقبل أضرحتهم كما تقبل الحجر الأسود، وكما تقبل جلد القرآن

Their graves should be kissed just like how the black stone and the skin of the Qur'ān are kissed. (Muḥammad al-Shīrāzī: *Maqālat al-Shī'ah* p. 8)

1 This is the view of the extremist among the Rawāfiḍ as stated by al-Qāḍī 'Ayāḍ, al-Baghdādī and Ibn Taymiyyah. And Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Wahhāb has cited that a person who believes in this is unanimously out of the fold. (See: p. 838 of this book).

2 See how they acknowledge mistakes for the prophets but claim completely infallibility for their Imāms!

3 *Mir'āt al-Rashād* p. 104.

And where their ancient sources classify visiting the grave of Ḥusayn as better than doing Ḥajj to the House of Allah ﷺ, we likewise find this grave belief being repeated by some of their contemporary scholars. They actively invite toward it due to there being immense reward in doing so considering the fact that it is the best of actions and devotions, as they allege.¹

Hence ‘Abd Allah al-Māmaqānī advises his son to visit the grave of Ḥusayn every day and says:

وعليك بني بزيارة قبره (يعني قبر الحسين) في كل يوم من البعد مرة، والضبي إليه في كل شهر مرة، وإن كنت في بلدة بعيدة ففي السنة مرة

And, O my son, you should visit his grave (the grave of Ḥusayn) everyday once from a distance. And you should proceed to it once in every month. And if you are in a town which is far, then once a year.²

Notice that this scholar does not advise his son to perform ṣalāh, rather he tells him to go to the grave where shirk is committed because that is the best of devotions for them. This is obviously the way of the polytheists.

His son³ makes the following comment upon this advice:

وقد ورد أن من زاره عارفا بحقه كتب الله له ثواب ألف حجة وألف عمرة

It appears in the tradition that whoever visits him knowing his right, Allah will record for him the reward of a thousand Ḥajj and a thousand ‘Umrahs.

Till he says:

1 ‘Aqā’id al-Imāmiyyah p. 133.

2 Mir’āt al-Rashād p. 105- 114.

3 Muḥyī al-Dīn al-Māmaqānī.

وكانما زار الله. وحق على الله ألا يعذبه بالنار، ألا وإن الإجابة تحت قبته والشفاء في تربته. ومن زار قبر الحسين عليه السلام ليلة النصف من شعبان وليلة الفطر، وليلة عرفة في سنة واحدة كتب الله له ألف حجة مبرورة وألف عمرة متقبلة، وقضيت له ألف حاجة من حوائج الدنيا والآخرة... ومن أتاه يوم عرفة عارقاً بحقه كتب الله له ألف حجة وألف عمرة متقبلات وألف غزوة مع نبي مرسل أو إمام عادل

And it is as if he has visited Allah [!!!]. It becomes incumbent upon Allah not to punish him with hell fire. Behold, acceptance of prayers is under his dome and cure is in his sand.¹ And whoever visits the grave of Ḥusayn عَمَّا تَنَام on the fifteenth night of Sha'bān, the night of ʿĪd al-Fiṭr, and the night of ʿArafah—all in one year—Allah will record for him a thousand accepted Ḥajj and a thousand accepted ʿUmrahs, and a thousand of his needs of this life and the afterlife will be fulfilled.² And whoever comes to him on the Day of ʿArafah being fully aware of his right, Allah will write for him the reward of a thousand Ḥajj, a thousand ʿUmrahs, and a thousand wars fought with a sent Nabī or a just ruler.³

This is how the ancient and recent books of the Shīʿah converge upon this polytheistic belief and how they attribute it to the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt and to Islam whereas the Muslims have no knowledge of it. It is only transmitted by a group of Shīʿī narrators. It can be said without doubt that by way of these anomalies they are announcing their falsehood and disgracing their creed. These alleged narrations had a great influence in the world of the Shīʿah due to them reviving the belief of the polytheists in the shrines of the Shīʿah and their holy sites. Hence these sites are frequently visited and the Masjids are abandoned. Despite all of this their scholars endorse this evil and strive to entrench it and perpetuate it.

On the other hand, some of their narrations explicitly warn against this evil, but their scholars conceal such narrations and do not want them to become known to their gullible followership. In fact they even deny the existence of such narrations thereby distancing their followership even further away from the light of truth.

1 *Mir'āt al-Rashād* p. 110 (see footnote).

2 *Mir'āt al-Rashād* p. 113 (see footnote).

3 *Ibid.*

One of their supreme authorities, as they describe him, Muḥsin al-Amīn whilst defending the Shī'ah in them converting graves into Masjids, in his book *al-Ḥuṣūn al-Manī'ah* says that all those narrations which appear in the seminal works of the Muslims which bear the prohibition of converting graves into Masjids and building upon them that they are exclusively narrated through the transmissions of the Ahl al-Sunnah and oppose the diffusely narrated traditions of the Ahl al-Bayt.¹

In response I say that this prohibition appears in many narrations which are narrated through Shī'ī transmissions as well. Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī has cited them in his book *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* just as others have as well.² So it is one of two things: either this person who is known as *al-Amīn* (trustworthy) is no so trustworthy after all, due to him wanting to conceal what features in their books, or he is ignorant of what appears in their collections despite him being falsely described as the *Āyat Allāh* (a sign of Allah).

Moving on, and regarding the names and attributes of Allah ﷻ their contemporary scholars hold the view of their later scholars, i.e. the view of Ta'ṭīl (denial of the attributes of Allah). And in this regard they follow the Mu'tazilah completely, to the extent that they believe that the Qur'ān is created,³ they deny that the believers will see Allah ﷻ in the afterlife,⁴ they deny the attributes of Allah ﷻ⁵ which are established in the Qur'ān and the Sunnah, and they describe Allah ﷻ with negatives. Hence their scholar al-Muẓaffar says the following under the topic: our belief regarding Allah:

ليس هو بجسم ولا صورة، وليس جوهرًا ولا عرضًا، وليس له ثقل أو خفة، ولا حركة أو سكون، ولا مكان ولا زمان، ولا يشار إليه

1 Muḥsin al-Amīn: *al-Ḥuṣūn al-Manī'ah* p. 27.

2 See what I have cited from their reliable books in this regard on p. 652.

3 Muḥsin al-Amīn: *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1/461; al-Amīnī al-Najafī: *al-Ghadīr* 3/139.

4 Muḥsin al-Amīn: *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1/463; a-Muẓaffar: *'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah* p. 59.

5 *Al-Ghadīr* 3/139.

He does not have a body nor a form; he is not substantial nor abstract; He is not characterised by heaviness or lightness; nor by motion or stagnation; He is not confined by space and time nor can he be pointed at.¹

As you might have picked up, in describing Allah *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى* with these sheer negatives they actually deny the existence of Allah altogether. This is nothing new for them, for these very words were repeated again and again by the Jahmiyyah before them. They are merely blindly following them. From here it is clear that those who assume that the Jahmiyyah, the deniers of the attributes of Allah, no more exist are mistaken.

Furthermore, they excommunicate all those who oppose them in the stance of *Ta'tīl*. Hence al-Muẓaffar says:

ومن قال... إنه ينزل إلى السماء الدنيا، أو إنه يظهر إلى أهل الجنة كالقمر، أو نحو ذلك فإنه بمنزلة الكافر به... وكذلك يلحق بالكافر من قال: إنه يتراءى لخلقه يوم القيامة

And he who says that he descends to the first heaven, or that he will appear before the people of Jannah like the moon, or anything of that sort, is equal in status with the one who disbelieves in him... And so will a person be like a disbeliever if he believes that Allah will be visible to his creation on the Day of Judgement.²

They claim that reason guided them to *Ta'tīl*.³ Amazing, was reason ever a decisive medium for receiving knowledge of the unseen? And can sound reason ever accept describing Allah *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى* with these negative traits for which there is no evidence and which openly violate aspects of revelation?

Furthermore, what is the crux of all those ideologies and philosophies which discussed this issue without any recourse to divine revelation? The crux is that

1 'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah p. 59.

2 Ibid. p. 59-60.

3 Ibid. p. 60.

they did not leave behind but a heap of contradictions and frivolities like the frivolities of kids. Ultimately all their views became a source of their confusion and anxiety. Likewise, what was the end result of all those theologians who made reason their guide and their navigator in Islamic history? Was it not confusion and ruination? Indeed those who worked with the methods of Kalām and the thinking processes of philosophy found that they do not quench any thirst nor satisfy any need. They realised that the best way is the way of the Qur’ān. But when they shunned it, all their efforts became in vain,¹ they wasted their time and efforts, they unnecessarily occupied the Ummah and diverted it from its mandatory obligations.

The method of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding the names and attributes of Allah ﷻ is indeed a great method. Because it abides by the Qur’ān and the Sunnah, and because it preserves the time, efforts, strength and reason of a Muslim from being wasted in investigating issues which he is not obligated to investigate and for knowing the precise description of which there is no way.

Nonetheless, there remains one thing, and that is another view of their contemporaries regarding *Tawḥīd* which they have adopted following in the footsteps of the Sufis who opine that there are different levels of *Tawḥīd*, the lowest of which is the apparent purport of the Kalimah Lā Ilāh illā Allah. These Sufis contrived in the Dīn such things for which Allah ﷻ gave no authority. And owing to these various levels they ultimately reached open disbelief i.e. the view of *Ittiḥād* (singularity of existence) and the view that the creation is itself the creator. Hence they deviated from reason and revelation, and they superseded the Christians (who believe in ʿĪsā being god-incarnate) in their shirk due to them believing in a general incarnation whereas the Christians believe in a specific one.

Despite all these problems, the scholars of the Shīʿah, who can be characterised as those who across the centuries transmitted to their people the scum of all the

1 See: *Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islam* 5/10-11; Ibn Abī al-ʿIz: *Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwīyyah* p. 169-172; Mullā ʿAlī al-Qārī: *al-Fiqh al-Akbar* p. 10.

innovative sects and the defilements of all the flawed human ideologies, adopted this problematic Sufi stance and transmitted it to their people, rather they even considered it part of their authentic beliefs.

Their scholar Ibrāhīm al-Zanjānī¹ in his book *‘Aqā’id al-Imāmiyyah al-Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah*² says the following under the title: ‘the belief of the Shī‘ah regarding Tawḥīd:

إن مراتب التوحيد أربع... توحيد العوام، وتوحيد الخواص، وتوحيد خواص الخواص، وتوحيد أخص الخواص، والأولى مدلول كلمة لا إله إلا الله.

There are four levels of Tawḥīd: the Tawḥīd of the commonality, the Tawḥīd of the elite, the Tawḥīd of the elite of the elite and the Tawḥīd of the most elite. The first level is the apparent purport of the Kalimah Lā ilāh illā Allāh.³

Commenting on this he says that, apart from the rest of the Muslims, his cult is privileged with the Tawḥīd of elite of the elite and the Tawḥīd of the most elite.⁴

He further says that although the text does not allow for the elucidation of these levels, but, he says that, that they imbibed this from the teachings of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Alī:

أول الدين معرفة، وكمال معرفته التصديق به، وكمال التصديق به توحيده، وكمال توحيده... نفي الصفات عنه. فمن وصف الله سبحانه فقد قرنه، ومن قرنه فقد ثناه، ومن ثناه فقد جزأه، ومن جزأه فقد جهله، ومن جهله فقد أشار إليه، ومن أشار إليه فقد حده، ومن حده فقد عده

The beginning of Dīn is recognition; and the perfection of recognition is in affirmation; and the perfection of affirmation is in Tawḥīd; and the

1 Al-Khūṭ describes him as the pillar of Islam and the support of the ‘Ulamā’.

2 This book has been approbated by some of their seniors like al-Khūṭ and Ḥasan al-Mūsawī.

3 *‘Aqā’id al-Imāmiyyah al-Ithnay ‘Ashariyyah* p. 24.

4 Ibid.

perfection of Tawḥīd is in denying any attribution of qualities to Him. Hence whoever attributes any quality to Him has coupled Him, and whoever has coupled Him has doubled Him, and whoever has doubled Him has considered him divisible, and whoever considers Him divisible is ignorant of Him, and whoever is ignorant of Him will point toward Him, and whoever will point toward Him will confine Him, and whoever will confine Him will enumerate Him.¹

This narration which they falsely attribute to Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī عليه السلام entails denying the attributes of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَعَظَمَانَهُ which are established in the Qur'ān and the Sunnah. And the belief that the perfection of Tawḥīd is the denial of the attributes is the stance of the Jahmiyyah who considered Tawḥīd to be one of their principles but then made it inclusive of the denial of the attributes; the aftermath of their stance was the denial of the Being of Allah. This is because denying the attributes necessarily leads to denying the Being, for one cannot envision the existence of a being without attributes in the external.

And because the stance of the Jahmiyyah regarding the denial of attributes is a product of the stance of *Ḥulūl*, incarnation, and *Ittiḥād*, singularity of existence,² it became his basis for the view he adopted regarding Tawḥīd being categorised into Tawḥīd of the elite and the Tawḥīd of the elite of the elite.

In order to understand the extent of their deviation, it is sufficient to note that they class the Tawḥīd with which the Messengers came and with which the divine books descended and to believe in which Allah commanded the first and last as the lowest level thereof. A level that is only behoving of the commonality. Do they have any evidence that they can present to us to prove this?³

Here we have in front of us the Word of Allah which descended upon his Rasūl and the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم and the verdicts of the best generations

1 Ibid. p. 24.

2 *Sharḥ al-Ṭahāwīyyah* p. 16.

3 Ibid.

after him, did this categorisation come from any one of them? They do not follow but the views of their scholars and their heretics; and apart from conjecture, following the demands of the ego and the dictates of devils from the Jinn and Men they have no firm knowledge.

Likewise, in order to understand the extreme extent which they have reached in ascending these levels, which according to them do not fall under the purport of Lā ilāh illā Allāh, it is sufficient to understand that it eventually makes a person who treads this path reach the pits of heresy, i.e. the belief in incarnation and singularity of existence.¹

1 Shaykh al-Islām has mentioned that the beginning of the view of Ittiḥād in the Ummah of Muḥammad ﷺ was during the era of Tatar dynasty (*Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 2/171).

Discussion 5: Imāmah

Imāmah as per the acknowledgement of the contemporaries is just like Nubuwwah¹ and a continuation of Nubuwwah,² or it is a station granted by Allah which is like Nubuwwah.³

It is one of the fundamentals of Islam according to them, Kāshif al-Ghiṭā' says:

إن الشيعة زادوا في أركان الإسلام ركنا آخر وهو الإمامة

The Shī'ah have added one more pillar to the pillars of Islam, and that is Imāmah.⁴

I did not find anything different in their position regarding Imāmah from the extremist position which was previously discussed. However, there are new claims regarding three pertinent issues in their books which they publish for the consumption of the Muslim world. These three issues are: their excommunication of the one who rejects Imāmah, their stance regarding Muslim governments, and their excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.

The First Issue: the stance of the contemporaries regarding the excommunication of the Muslims which is found in their seminal works

You will find two outwardly divergent views among the contemporaries regarding this issue. They can easily be considered as two views by someone who is not aware of their heritage (but in actual fact they are one and the same).

The first view says that the denier of Imāmah does not leave the fold of Islam. It condemns those who say that the Shī'ah excommunicate those besides them.

1 *Aṣl al-Shī'ah wa Uṣūluhā* p. 58; Khalīl Yāsīn: *al-Imām 'Alī* p. 327; Bāqir al-Qurashī: *al-Rasūl al-A'zam ma' Khulafā'ihi* p. 18.

2 Al-Muẓaffar: *'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah* p. 94.

3 Al-Samāwī: *al-Imāmah* 1/65.

4 *Aṣl al-Shī'ah wa Uṣūluhā* p. 58. This is a clear confession that the Shī'ah added a pillar to the pillars of Islam.

And the second view openly excommunicates without any Taqiyyah or compunction.

As with regard to the first view, when Mūsā Jār Allāh made the following claim:

إن كتب الشيعة صرحت أن كل الفرق كافرة وأهلها نواصب

The books of the Shī'ah unequivocally state that all the sects are disbelievers and that their adherents are haters of the Ahl al-Bayt.¹

Muḥsin al-Amīn responded by saying:

سبحانك اللهم هذا بهتان عظيم، ولا يعتقد أحد من الشيعة بذلك، بل هي متفقة على أن الإسلام هو ما عليه جميع فرق المسلمين من الإقرار بالشهادتين إلا من أنكر ضروريا من ضروريات الدين كوجوب الصلوة وحرمة الخمر وغير ذلك، وعمدة الخلاف بين المسلمين هو في أمر الخلافة، وهي ليست من ضروريات الدين بالبدئية، لأن ضروري الدين ما يكون ضروريا عند جميع المسلمين وهو ليست كذلك

Pure are you, O my Lord. This is indeed a great accusation. None of the Shī'ah believe this. Rather all of them unanimously agree that Islam is what is embodied by all the sects of the Muslims, i.e. the confession of the Shahādātayn, yes with the exclusion of a person who rejects an aspect of Dīn which is categorically established like the obligation of ṣalāh and the prohibition of consuming wine, etc. The issue of Khilāfah is the crux of the dispute which exists between the Muslims. And it is obviously not from the categorically established aspects of Dīn. This is owing to the fact that an article of faith is only classed as categorical if it is incontrovertibly established according to all the Muslims and Khilāfah fails to meet this requirement.²

And Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā' says the following:

ومن لم يؤمن بالإمامة فهو مسلم ومؤمن بالمعنى الأعم، تترتب عليه جميع أحكام الإسلام من حرمة دمه وماله وعرضه، ووجوب حفظه وحرمة غيبته وغير ذلك، لا أنه بعدم الاعتقاد بالإمامة يخرج من كونه مسلما- معاذ الله- نعم يظهر أثر التدين بالإمامة في منازل القرب والكرامة يوم القيامة

1 *Al-Washī'ah* p. 105. This has been proven already from the sources of the Shī'ah on p. 1012.

2 Muḥsin al-Amīn: *al-Shī'ah Bayn al-Ḥaqā'iq wa al-Awhām* p. 176; *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 1/457.

And a person who does not believe in Imāmah is a Muslim and a believer in the general sense of these terms. All the rulings of Islam will apply to him in terms of his life, his property and his dignity being sacred, and in terms of amnesty being necessary for him and the impermissibility of backbiting regarding him;¹ the implication is not that due to not believing in Imāmah he no more remains a Muslim. Yes of course the benefits of believing in Imāmah will become evident on the Day of Judgement in the form of attaining proximity to Allah and dignity.²

Similar statements have been made by other contemporary Shī'ah as well.³

And as with regard to the second view, there still remains amongst their scholars and Āyāt those who blurt this misguidance and openly excommunicate the Muslims, like 'Alī al-Yazdī al-Ḥā'irī,⁴ 'Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Rashatī⁵ and 'Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍālī.⁶

1 Why do you revile the Ṣaḥābah عليهم السلام then if according to your confession they were only opposers of Imāmah?

2 *Aṣl al-Shī'ah* p. 58-59.

3 'Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Mūsawī: *Ajwibah Masā'il Jār Allāh* p. 39; Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Zayn al-'Āmilī: *al-Shī'ah fī al-Tārīkh* p. 32; al-Khunaizī: *al-Da'wah al-Islamiyyah* 2/260; Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah: *al-Shī'ah Fī al-Mizān* p. 269; Luṭf Allah al-Ṣāfi: *Ma' Muḥibb al-Dīn Fī Khuṭūṭihī* al-'Arīḍah p. 95.

4 Whom they describe as 'the senior of the jurists and the Mujtahidīn, the evidence of Islam and the Muslims, and the greatest sign of Allah in the universe', whereas Islam is free from him. One of his books is: *Ilzām al-Nāṣib Fī Ithbāt al-Ḥujjah al-Ghā'ib*. According to him the Ahl al-Sunnah and all the Muslims who do not believe in their fictitious Mahdī are Nawāṣib, haters of the Ahl al-Bayt. He died in 1333 A.H.

5 He openly excommunicates the entire Ummah to the exclusion of his cult. And he opines that the cause of the disbelief of the Ummah is Abū Bakr and 'Umar. He says:

إن أبابكر وعمر هم السببان لإضلال هذه الأمة إلى يوم القيامة

Abū Bakr and 'Umar are the cause of the deviance of this Ummah till the Day of Judgement.

(*Kashf al-Istibāh* p. 98.)

See how these scholars remain victims of the ideologies of the heretics of the bygone era. Nonetheless, he writes this view which he openly claims in response to some of the Ahl al-Sunnah, Shaykh Mūsā Jār Allāh. This implies that Taqīyyah has various levels and shades and that what is concealed from us is even more severe.

6 Footnote on next page.

Then sometimes some of their scholars tread both paths, i.e. they at times emerge with the view of excommunication and at times with the contrary, given various situations and conditions, thanks to the flexibility Taqiyyah allows. One such scholar is Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar who in his book *‘Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah* suggests that a Muslim is the one who concedes the Shahādātayn irrespective of which denomination he belongs to.¹ But, in his other book *al-Saqīfah* he excommunicates all the Muslims from after the demise of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. He says:

مات النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم ولا بد أن يكون المسلمون كلهم - لا أدري الآن - قد انقلبوا على أعقابهم

Nabī ﷺ passed away and all the Muslim back then -I do not know of today- turned away on their heels.²

See how he passes the ruling of apostasy upon the Ṣaḥābah, the Ahl al-Bayt and the entire Ummah, and how he expresses doubt regarding any of them having imān. With the exception of what is attributed to the Kāmiliyyah, none of the Shī'ah ever took on this extreme in the past. The Kāmiliyyah excommunicated 'Alī for not demanding his right just as they excommunicated the Ṣaḥābah for not pledging their allegiance to him. But this sect does not exist with this name today, and one would think that no one bears any of their views in this time and that its ideology has seized to continue. But then we are appalled to find that it is still alive and kicking in the dogma of the Twelvers and that some of their senior scholars still openly subscribe to it.

Footnote 6 of page 1435

He acknowledges that Imāmah is a pillar from the pillars of Dīn (*al-Tarbiyah al-Dīniyyah* p. 63), which implies that a person who rejects Imāmah in actual fact rejects a pillar of Dīn and thus is from the disbelievers. He contrives this ill whilst he stays amidst the Ahl al-Sunnah and benefits from their bounties after having lived as an exile (for his is originally from Iraq but now stays in Saudi and works in some of its universities).

1 *‘Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah* p. 155.

2 *Al-Saqīfah* p. 19.

This is not surprising, because the Twelver dogma has the ability to bring to the fore many of the extremist sects of the past with its books and collections all of which are filled with all types of anomalies to the greatest possible extent.

This type of approach is adopted by other contemporary Shī'ī scholars as well.¹

These are the two approaches which seemingly are different, but in actual fact they are the same; for those who consider the Ummah Muslims are no different from those who excommunicate them. Here under we will explain why.

Those who consider the people Muslims only outwardly consider them to be so. As for covertly, they likewise consider them disbelievers and doomed to Jahannam forever as per the consensus of their cult.

This stance has been proclaimed by their early scholars and their contemporaries. And if you ponder well enough you will find subtle indications toward this in the verdicts of those who do not excommunicate the Muslims; a person who is aware of their belief in this regard and is acquainted with their ways of practicing Taqiyyah will pick this up.

One of their early scholars who has made mention of this is Zayn al-Dīn ibn 'Alī al-Āmilī, *'al-Shahīd al-Thānī'* (the second martyr), who died in 966 A.H. He says:

1 Consider for example 'Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Mūsawī. He claims in a number of his books that the Shī'ah do not excommunicate the Muslims (see: his letter to the academy of Arabic knowledge, situated in Damascus which was published in Najaf in the year 1387 A.H.; *Ajwibah Masā'il Jār Allāh* p. 39, etc.). But on the other hand he excommunicates the great Ṣaḥābī and the most prolific narrator of ḥadīth Abū Hurayrah. In fact he even excommunicates any person who does not believe in his Twelve Imāms because he claims that Imāmāh according to them is from the pillars of Dīn (see: *al-Fuṣūl al-Muhimmah* p. 32). He likewise asserts that narrations which talk of the general īmān of the believers have to be qualified with belief in the Imāmāh of the Twelve Imāms because they are the door of forgiveness and only the one who enters it will be forgiven (Ibid. p. 32). And finally he says that a person who gives an alternate interpretation of Imāmāh or errs regarding it will not be excused according to their consensus (Ibid. p. 45).

إن القائلين بإسلام أهل الخلاف (يعني أهل السنة وسائر المسلمين من غير طائفتهم) يريدون.. صحة جريان أحكام المسلمين عليهم في الظاهر، لا أنهم مسلمون في نفس الأمر، ولذا نقلوا الإجماع على دخولهم النار.

The intent of those who hold the opinion of the Islam of the opposition (i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah and the rest of the Muslims beside their cult) is that the rules of Muslims are applicable to them outwardly; not that they are Muslims in reality. That is why the Shī'ah are unanimous that they will enter Jahannam.¹

He further says:

كأن الحكمة في ذلك هو التخفيف عن المؤمنين لمسيب الحاجة إلي مخالطتهم في أكثر الأزمنة الأمكنة

The wisdom behind this² probably is making it easy for the believers³ due to the need for associating with them always being present in most times and places.⁴

And their scholar al-Majlisī says;

ويظهر من بعض الأخبار بل كثير منها أنهم في الدنيا أيضا في حكم الكفار، لكن لما علم الله أن أئمة الجور وأتباعهم يستولون على الشيعة وهم يتلون بمعاشرتهم... أجرى الله عليهم حكم الإسلام توسعة، فإذا ظهر القائم يجري عليهم حكم سائر الكفار في جميع الأمور، وفي الآخرة يدخلون النار ماكتبن فيها أبدا مع الكفار. وبه يجمع بين الأخبار كما أشار إليه المفيد والشهيد الثاني

What seems apparent from some narrations, actually from many of them, is that even in this world they hold the status of disbelievers. But because Allah ﷻ knew that tyrant rulers and their followers will rule over the Shī'ah and that the latter will be tested with socialising with the former, out of His mercy He made the rules of Islam applicable to the former.

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* 8/368.

2 i.e. the wisdom behind outwardly considering them Muslims

3 Referring to his cult. Because they consider īmān to be their exclusive quality.

4 *Bihār al-Anwār* 8/368.

Hence when the Mahdī will emerge he will enforce upon them all the rules of the disbelievers. And in the hereafter they will enter Jahannam forever with the disbelievers. This is how the contradictory narrations can be reconciled, as is suggested by al-Mufīd and al-Shahīd al-Thānī.¹

As for the views of the contemporaries in this regard, their supreme authority Shihāb al-Dīn al-Ḥusaynī al-Marʿashī al-Najafī says that the fundamentals of Dīn are of two types:

قسم يترتب عليه جريان حكم المسلم وهو الشهادة بالوحدانية والشهادة بالرسالة. وقسم يترتب عليه النجاة في الآخرة، والتخلص من عذاب الله والفوز برضوانه والدخول في الجنة، فيحرم دخولها على من لم يعترف به ويساق إلى النار في زمرة الكافرين ويسمى هذا القسم بأصول الإيمان

One type is those fundamentals upon the existence of which the rules which apply to a Muslim become applicable, and they are: testifying to the Oneness of Allah and testifying to the Prophethood of Nabī ﷺ. The other is those fundamentals whereupon is based salvation in the afterlife, attaining the pleasure of Allah and gaining admission into Jannah. Hence a person who does not acknowledge them will be deprived from entry therein. He will be dragged to Jahannam with the band of disbelievers. This type is known as the fundamentals of īmān.

He further goes on to mention examples of the second type. He says:

الاعتقاد بالإمامة، والاعتراف بالإمام

Believing in Imāmah and acknowledging the Imām.

He then says:

إن الدليل على ذلك هو ارتداد جماعة من الصحابة بعد ارتحال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم، إلى الكفر، ومن المعلوم أنه لم يصدر بعد ارتحال من الصحابة ما يصلح أن يكون موجبا للارتداد إلى الكفر، ولم يعدلوا عن الشهادة بالوحدانية والنبوة غير أنهم أنكروا الإمامة

¹ Ibid. 8/369-370.

The proof for this is the apostasy of a group of the Ṣaḥābah after the demise of Nabī ﷺ. For it is a known fact that no such action occurred on the path of the Ṣaḥābah which would necessitate apostasy; they did not turn away from their confession of the Oneness of Allah and Nubuwwah but they rejected Imāmah.¹

From these quotes the smokescreen of Taqiyyah dissipates and it becomes clear that when some of their scholars consider their opponents Muslims what they actually mean is ‘outward Islam’ according to the definition they have invented. If you deliberate on their statements you will surely grasp their intent. For example, consider the statement of Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’ and you will notice that he has alluded to this in his words:

نعم يظهر أثر التدين بالإمامة في منازل القرب والكرامة يوم القيامة

Yes of course the benefits of believing in Imāmah will become evident on the Day of Judgement in the form of attaining proximity to Allah and dignity.

In spite of this, some affiliates of the Ahl al-Sunnah still gave credence to his statement.²

As for Muḥsin al-Amīn, he has also alluded to this erroneous position in a number of sentences in his speech. Consider:

إلا من أنكر ضروريا من ضروريات الدين كوجوب الصلوة وحرمة الخمر

Yes a person who rejects an aspect of Dīn which is categorically established, for example the obligation of ṣalāh, the prohibition of consuming wine, etc., (will be out of the fold of Islam).

1 Shihāb al-Najafī: in his annotations upon the book *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq* of al-Tusturī 2/294-295.

2 Faṭḥī ‘Abd al-‘Azīz: *al-Khumainī al-Ḥall al-Islamī al-Badīl* p. 58-59.

And as is obvious, Imāmah is greater than the obligation of ṣalāh and the prohibition of wine without any dispute between them. He thus alluded to the superior by invoking the inferior.

Likewise:

وعمدة الخلاف بين المسلمين هو في أمر الخلافة، وهي ليست من ضروريات الدين بالبدئية

The crux of the dispute between the Muslims is the issue of Khilāfah. And it is obviously not from the categorically established aspects of Dīn.

The Taqiyyah hidden herein is not easily discernible by those who are not aware of their style. Hence some people did not pick it up and were deceived by it.¹

His intention here is Khilāfah according to the Muslims, not the doctrine of Imāmah which they believe in, which is why he used the word ‘Khilāfah’.

According to them they are two completely different concepts. One of their scholars says:

الإمامة تعني رئاسة الدين، والخلافة رئاسة دولة كما فهم من النصوص الواردة

Imāmah means providing leadership in Dīn whilst Khilāfah means leadership of a dynasty, as is understood from the relevant texts.²

And that is why they aver that the Imāmah of ‘Alī started with the demise of Rasūl Allah ﷺ³ but the Ṣaḥābah in their Khilāfah ‘separated Dīn from the dynasty’.⁴

1 Al-Zu’bī: *Lā Sunnah wa lā Shī’ah* p. 84.

2 Muḥammad ‘Alī al-Ḥasanī: *Ḥīl al-Tashayyū* p. 38.

3 Al-Mufīd: *al-Irshād* p. 12. Refer to p. 57 of this book.

4 Al-Ṣādiqī: *‘Alī wa al-Ḥākīmūn* p. 83.

The second Issue: their stance regarding Muslim governments

When Shaykh Mūsā Jār Allāh said:

إن الشيعة تعتبر الحكومات الإسلامية وقضاتها طواغيت

The Shī'ah consider Muslim governments and their judges to be *Ṭawāghūt* (devils or idols).¹

One of the Shī'ah scholars responded thus:

الطواغيت من الحكومات وقضاتها عند الشيعة إنما هم الظالمون الغاشمون المستحلون من آل محمد ما حرم الله ورسوله... أما غيرهم من حكومات الإسلام فأن من مذهب الشيعة وجوب مؤازرتهم في أمر يتوقف عليه عز الإسلام ومنعته، وحماية ثغوره حفظ بيضته. ولا يجوز عندهم شق عصا المسلمين وتفريق جماعتهم بمخالفته. بل يجب أن تعامل سلطاتها القائمة بأمورها والحامي لثغورها معاملة الخلفاء بالحق

According to the Shī'ah only those governments and their judges are devils who are oppressors of the household of Muḥammad and who desacralize what Allah has rendered sacred of their rights... As for all other Islamic governments, the stance of the Shī'ah regarding them is that it is compulsory to support them in matters which are prerequisites for the glory of Islam, its might, the safety of its borders and the preservation of its territory. It is not permissible according to them to split asunder the unity of the Muslims and divide them by opposing any such government. Rather it is compulsory for them to treat its ruler and the protector of its boundaries in a like manner that just rulers are treated.²

A similar stance is adopted by other Shī'ah scholars.³

Does this stance represent the detraction of the contemporaries from the default position of their dogma in this regard which we have discussed already in the

1 *Al-Washī'ah* p. 105. This has passed already on p. 1002.

2 *Ajwibah Masā'il Jār Allāh* p. 38-39.

3 See: Luṭf Allah al-Ṣāfi: *Ma' Muḥibb al-Dīn Fī Khuṭūṭihī al-'Arīḍah* p. 89-90.

previous chapters? Or is it tainted with Taqiyyah and manipulation due to the addressee being a Sunnī and the address being directed to the Ahl al-Sunnah, for whenever there is dialogue of this nature Taqiyyah is always part of it.

In answering this I say the following:

A group of their contemporary scholars still continue to proclaim that their dogma only acknowledges the rulership of the Twelve Imāms; they proclaim this without suggesting that there is a divergent view.

Their scholar Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah says:

إن شروط الإمامة لم تتوافر في واحد ممن تولى الخلافة غير الإمام علي وولده الحسن بخاصة من جاء بعدهما-كذا- فمن الطبيعي إذن-كما يقول- أن لا يعترفوا بإمامة أي حاكم غير علي وأبنائه، وإن ينظروا إليه نظرهم إلى من غضب أهل البيت حقهم الإلهي ودفعهم عن مقامهم ومراتبهم التي رتبهم الله فيها، وكان الحاكم يرى في الشيعة العدو اللدود والحزب المعارض لحكمه

With the exception of Imām ‘Alī and his son Ḥasan, the conditions of Imāmah were not found in any of those who assumed the Khilāfah, and more so in those who came after them. It is thus natural that the Shī‘ah did not concede the rulership of any ruler besides ‘Alī and his children. Likewise it is normal that they viewed them as those who usurped the divine right of the Ahl al-Bayt and repelled them from the positions which Allah ﷻ had accorded them. On the flip side, the rulers would also see in the Shī‘ah an ardent enemy and a threat to their rule.

He further says:

فمبدأ التشيع لا ينفصل بحال عن معارضة الحاكم إذا لم تتوفر فيه الشروط. وهي النص والحكمة، والأفضلية... ومن هنا كانوا يمثلون الحزب المعارض دينا وإيمانا

The concept of Shī‘ism then is inseparable from the idea of opposing the ruler if he does not embody the necessary prerequisites. Which are: divine appointment, wisdom and virtue. They have always, therefore, represented the opposing side in creed and in faith.¹

1 *Al-Shī‘ah wa al-Ḥākīmūn* p. 24.

As you can see, he attributes the disavowing of every rulership with the exception of the rulership of the ‘divinely appointed Imāms’ to all the Shī‘ah. And that is why they hold a similar stance regarding the righteous Khilāfah, the Khilāfah of Nubuwwah. Their scholar al-Ṣādiq¹ says:

الخلفاء الثلاثة شركاء في التآمر على الإسلام

The three Khulafā’ were partners in conspiring against Islam.²

And another of their scholars says:

تلاعبت الأيادي الأثيمة بالإسلام والمسلمين من الحكام والحاكمين منذ وفاة النبي الكريم صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم

The sinful hands of the rulers have manipulated Islam and the Muslims since the demise of Nabī ﷺ.³

Similarly, they aver that the rulership of the Muslim Ummah is the sole prerogative of the Hidden Maḥdī, and thus whoever else assumes it besides him is a usurper. Some of them, however, do exclude *Wilāyah al-Faqīh* (the authority of the jurist) due to him having the right of representation. Their scholar ‘Abd al-Hādī al-Faḍālī says:

إن دولة المنتظر هي دولة الإسلام

The empire of the awaited is the empire of Islam.⁴

And besides his empire no empire is truly an Islamic one. He says:

1 The representative of the academic seminary in Najaf, as he describes himself.

2 ‘Alī wa al-Ḥākimūn p. 78. Also see p. 83.

3 Muḥammad ‘Alī al-Ḥasanī: *Fī Zīlāl al-Tashayyū* p. 558.

4 *Fī Intizār al-Imām* p. 57.

إن علينا أن نعيش في فترة الغيبة مترقبين لليوم الموعود الذي يبدؤه الإمام المنتظر عليه السلام بالقضاء على الكفر

We should live in the era of occultation with anticipation of the promised day which the awaited Imām عجله الله تعالى will commence with putting an end to disbelief.¹

However, the anticipation for the Mahdī does not entail having peaceful relations with Muslims governments, as he says:

إن الذي يفاد من الروايات في هذا المجال هو أن المراد من الانتظار هو وجوب التمهيد والتوطئة بظهور الإمام المنتظر

What is deduced from the narrations on this topic is that anticipation means paving the way and setting the scene for the appearance of the Mahdī.²

What does paving the way mean? He explains:

إن التوطئة لظهور الإمام المنتظر تكون بالعمل السياسي عن طريق إثارة الوعي السياسي والقيام بالثورة المسلحة

Paving the way for the emergence of the awaited Imām will be by way of political activism, i.e. by way of instigating the political conscience and giving rise to an armed revolution.³

After studying all these statements you will notice that they disavow any Muslim government with the exception of a Shīʿī government. And that they intend to prepare the masses to accept their revolts via the medium of spreading their dogma with the various platforms. This is what al-Faḍālī deems the political conscience.

1 Ibid. 67.

2 Ibid. 69.

3 Ibid. 70.

It is not unclear that this approach to which the Twelver scholars have inclined is not in harmony with the approach of the Twelvers of past. Hence the following appears in *al-Ghaybah* of al-Nu‘mānī:

عن أبي الجارود عن أبي جعفر عليه السلام: قال: قلت له عليه السلام: أوصني، فقال: أوصيك بتقوى الله، وأن تلزم بيتك، وإياك والخوارج منا، فإنهم ليسوا على شيء ولا إلى شيء

Abū al-Jārūd says that he asked Abū Ja‘far عليه السلام, “Advise me.”

He said, “I advise you to fear Allah and to cling on to your house. And beware of the rebels amongst us, for they are not upon any foundation nor will their end result be anything substantial.”¹

Al-Majlisī explains:

والخوارج منا أي مثل زيد وبني الحسن

The rebels amongst us, i.e. Zaid and the children of Ḥasan.²

Their narration thus prevents them from revolting even if it be by following the Ahl al-Bayt. What then would be the ruling of revolting by following those besides them?

Abū ‘Abd Allah likewise ordered them, as appears in their narrations, to refrain from giving rise to upheavals after the occultation of the Mahdī:

كونوا أحلاس بيوتكم فإن الفتنة على من أثارها

Become the doormats of your homes, for indeed the onus of the fitnah is upon the one who instigates it.³

1 Al-Nu‘mānī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 129; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/136.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 52/136.

3 *Al-Ghaybah* p. 131.

And al-Bāqir is similarly reported to have said:

اسكنوا ما سكنت السماوات والأرض، أي ولا تخرجوا على أحد

Remain calm as long as the heavens and the earth remain calm, i.e. and do not revolt against anyone.¹

Their scholar al-Nu'mānī has established a chapter on this topic by the title *chapter regarding those narrations which order the Shī'ah to exercise patience, withhold, anticipate during the occultation and to not hasten in seeking the decree of Allah and his plan.*² In this chapter he cites multiple narrations and thereafter makes the following comment:

انظروا رحمكم الله إلى هذا التأديب من الأئمة عليهم السلام إلى أمرهم ورسمهم في الصبر والكف،
والانتظار للفرج، وذكرهم هلاك المستعجلين

Look, may Allah have mercy on you, at the disciplining of the Imāms, at their order and directive to be patient, withhold and anticipate the opening, and at their mention of the destruction of the impatient.³

This is what the scholars of the third century had endorsed, so either the contemporaries do not know of their stance, or they no more lend any importance to the occultation due to them knowing that the awaited will never emerge due to him not being born. And maybe that is why they are calling for revolutions and for giving shape to an empire.

This is what the contemporaries proclaim. Over and above the excommunication of the Muslims governments which already existed, they added the call for revolutions against them before the emergence of the Mahdī. In fact their scholar Khomeini asserted that it is not permissible to initiate a Jihād until the

1 Ibid. 134.

2 Ibid. 129.

3 Ibid. 134.

awaited Mahdī appears,¹ but he himself opposed his assertion by initiating the revolution with force, as will come.² This is because their dogma changes with fluctuating conditions and situations due to it being subjugated to the fancies of their scholars. And also because the door of interpretation is very wide for them, rather it has no limits and contours.

Furthermore, it is owing to this stance that they consider the reign of disbelievers over Muslim lands to be better than the reign of Muslims. Shaykh Rashīd al-Riḍā thus quotes the Shīʿī scholar Abū Bakr al-ʿAṭṭās saying:

إنه يفضل أن يكون الانكليز حكاما في الأراضي المقدسة على ابن سعود

He prefers that the English rule over the blessed lands instead of the son of Saʿūd.³

Likewise their scholar Ḥusayn al-Khurāsānī has revealed to us that every Shīʿī yearns for the conquest of Makkah and Madīnah and for eliminating the Wahhābī rule therein. He says:

إن طوائف الشيعة يترقبون من حين وآخر أن يوما قريبا يفتح الله لهم تلك الأراضي المقدسة لمرة أخرى -كذا- ليدخلوها آمنين مطمئنين فيطوفوا بيت ربهم، ويؤدوا مناسكهم، ويزوروا قبور ساداتهم ومشايخهم... ولا يكون هناك سلطان جائر يتجاوز عليهم بهتك أعراضهم، وذهاب حرمة إسلامهم، وسفك دمائهم المحقونة ونهب أموالهم المحترمة ظلما وعدوانا حقق الله تعالى أمانينا

The various sects of the Shīʿah anticipate every now and then the coming of a day wherein Allah ﷻ will conquer for them the blessed lands for a second time so that they may enter them with peace and serenity. And so that they may circumambulate around the house of their Lord, fulfil the rituals of their pilgrimage, and visit the graves of their masters and scholars. All of this without a tyrant ruler who will wrong them by

1 *Tahrīr al-Wasīlah* 1/482.

2 See the chapter regarding the empire of the Āyāt: p. 1172. (Add page number later)

3 *Al-Manār* vol. 9 p. 605.

defaming them, disenchanting their Islam, shedding their blood which is preserved and usurping their respected properties oppressively. May Allah سبحانه وتعالى make our wishes come true.¹

This is how this Rāfiḍī desires that the blessed lands be conquered, as if currently they are under the reign of the disbelievers. The reasoning he gives for this desire is that he intends to perform Ḥajj and do visitations, as if he and his cult are barred from doing so. In reality what he desires is to establish shirk and destroy Tawḥīd in the two pure Ḥarams.

Moving on, if this is what their scholars openly proclaim, and if upon this their seminal works are unanimous, then what is the reality of the stance of ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn and his likes?

In reality his stance is not unlike the stance of the scholars whose statements we just cited. The only difference is that he phrased his position with the disguise of dissimulation and in a way that deceives those who are not aware of their strategies in practicing Taqiyyah. Consider the following:

الطواغيت من الحكومات وقضاتها عند الشيعة إنما هم الظالمون لآل محمد

According to the Shī‘ah only those governments and their judges are devils who are oppressors of the household of Muḥammad.

He has not parted from the default position of his dogma by making this statement, because according to them any person who assumes rulership besides ‘Alī Amīr al-Mu’minīn and Ḥasan is an oppressor, because Imāmah is their exclusive privilege and their right in which no one has any share. And thus whoever besides them will assume rulership will necessarily be a tyrant. Hence Ibn Bābawayh says:

فمن ادعى الإمامة وهو غير إمام فهو الظالم الملعون

1 *Al-Islam ‘alā Ḍaw’ al-Tashayyu’* p. 132-133.

Whoever lays claim to Imāmah without actually being eligible to be one is indeed the oppressor, the accursed.¹

And that is exactly why they deem Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be the first oppressor.

Likewise consider:

فأن الشيعة ترى وجوب موازرتهم في أمر يتوقف عليه عز الإسلام

The Shī'ah consider it compulsory to support them in matters which are prerequisites for the glory of Islam.

Here also he has not in any way parted with position of the Shī'ah, because what he means by the 'glory of Islam' is the victory of his dogma and his cult. This statement would thus purport the following: being part of Muslim governments in order to destroy them and give authority to the Shī'ah to implement their dogma, or squander their assets and channel them in their activities. And this why you will find that Khomeini endorsed what al-Naṣīr al-Ṭūsī had done when he when assumed office as minister of Hulagu in order to destroy the Islamic Khilāfah and glorify Shī'ism. He says:

إن من باب التقية الجائزة دخول الشيعة في ركب السلاطين، إذ كان من دخوله الشكلي نصر الإسلام
والمسلمين مثل دخول نصير الدين الطوسي

Part of permissible Taqiyyah is that a Shī'ī joins the court of the monarch when by him outwardly doing so there is hope of victory for Islam and the Muslims. Like how Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī had joined.²

In conclusion, as you can see, their dogma did not increase but in its extremism and radicalism.

1 *Al-ʿItiqādāt* p. 112.

2 *Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 142.

The Third Issue: the stance of the contemporaries regarding the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ

Has anything changed in the dogma of this cult regarding the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ from what we have presented previously in light of their seminal works? Especially after the rise of calls for common understanding and unity, the pouncing of the infidel enemy upon the Ummah from every possible direction, and the passage of many centuries wherein the Ummah has not witnessed a generation nobler and more virtuous than that unique Qur'ānic generation, the generation of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ?

Have the minds of the Shī'ah and their hearts opened to the reality? Have they finally realised the gravity of the fables which their ancient books carry regarding the apostasy of the Ṣaḥābah and the alleged clash between them and the Ahl al-Bayt? Has not the time come for them to believe in the divine revelation, the pristine Sunnah, the unanimity of the Ummah and the incontrovertible facts of Dīn and history? Has not the time come for them to make a choice between latching on to that and between remaining beguiled by the reports of a bunch of liars who are infamous for their iniquity and their lies? Can sound reason ever accept the narrations of a band of liars and belie all the Ṣaḥābah who were pleased with Allah and with whom in turn he was pleased?

All those dark pages which contain the denigration, cursing and excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah, who transmitted this Dīn and passed it on to us, in actual fact entail criticising the religion of Islam and its Messenger صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. And therefore it is the obligation of the earnest and honest Shī'ah to announce their disapproval of all those anomalous and heretical views which target the noble Companions of Rasūl Allāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ with curses and excommunication, especially if they want to form unity with the Muslims. They should inform their followership first and the rest of the Muslims thereafter that these narrations and views belong to some heretical and misguided sects of the past and that these sects will carry the blame thereof and the blame of all those who will follow them till the Day of Judgment. They should do this in order to alleviate the hatred which has long settled in the hearts of the Ahl al-Sunnah from the bygone centuries up until now. And the best way to remove this hatred is that they clarify that they do not believe in

the validity of all those views which cause a believer to recoil with indignance in whichever part of the world he may be. Because no sincere believer will ever be open to studying the beliefs of a sect, unless he is gifted with special mental abilities, if he learns that it considers cursing Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رضي الله عنه, whose īmān if weighed with the īmān of the rest of the Ummah will outweigh it, or cursing ‘Umar رضي الله عنه, whose contributions to Islam are unmatched by that of anyone else, an act of worship? Likewise he will never trust the views of this sect if he comes to learn that it considers these curses to be devotions? Doing away with these defilements and anathemas is from the foundations of building common grounds and unity. If they are really sincere in uniting with the Muslims, then they should openly announce this disapproval and change.¹ They should not merely do so in order to spread their beliefs in the lands of the Ahl al-Sunnah deceptively.

Nonetheless, what do the contemporary Shī‘ah say on this topic? One of the people who emerged in the present age is a person by the name Aḥmad al-Kisrawī. Professor Maḥmūd al-Mallāḥ says the following regarding him:

لم يظهر في عالم الشيعة أحد في عياره منذ ظهر اسم شيعي على وجه الأرض

Since the inception of the term Shī‘ī there hasn’t emerged a man of his calibre in the Shī‘ah world.²

He worked as a lecturer in the University of Tehran and likewise presided over several judicial positions.⁴

Al-Kisrawī discovered the falsity of the stance of the Shī‘ah regarding the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. He disavowed all those fables which were fabricated by the haters regarding them turning apostate due to opposing ‘the emphatic nomination of ‘Alī’, as they allege, and expounded upon the deviance of the Shī‘ah in this regard. He says:

1 Muḥammad Abū Zuhrah: *al-Imām al-ṣādiq* p. 12.

2 What he intends by ‘Shī‘ah’ and ‘Shī‘ī’ is ‘Rāfiḍah’ and ‘Rāfiḍī’, not Shī‘ah in general, otherwise this generalisation would not be correct.

3 Maḥmūd al-Mallāḥ: *al-Wajīz ‘alā al-Wajīz* p. 278.

4 For his biography see: Yahyā Dhakā’: *Kārwand Kisrawī* (introduction); *al-Tashayyū’ wa al-Shī‘ah* (Introduction); *Mu‘jam al-Mu‘allifīn* 2/53.

وأما ما قالوا عن ارتداد المسلمين بعد موت النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم إلا ثلاثة أو أربعة منهم فاجتراء منهم على الكذب البهتان، فلقاتل أن يقول: كيف ارتدوا وهم كانوا أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم آمنوا به حين كذبه الآخرون ودافعوا عنه، واحتملوا الأذى في سبيله ثم ناصروه في حروبه ولم يرغبوا عنه بأنفسهم. ثم أي نفع لهم في خلافة أبي بكر ليرتدوا عن دينهم لأجله، فأى الأمرين أسهل احتمالا: أكذب رجل أو رجلين من ذوي الأغراض الفاسدة، أو ارتداد بضع مئات من خلص المسلمين. فأجيئونا إن كان لكم جواب

As for their assertion that, besides three or four individuals, all the Muslims apostatised after the demise of Nabī ﷺ, it is based upon their boldness to lie and calumniate. For someone can object that how could they have apostatised when they were the Companions of Nabī ﷺ who believed in him when everyone else belied him; who defended him and bore difficulties for his cause; and who stood by his side in all his campaigns and did not give preference to themselves over him? Furthermore, was there really any benefit for them in the Khilāfah of Abū Bakr owing to which they would abandon Islam? Which of the two is more likely: the lying of one or two people who had ulterior motives or the apostasy of hundreds of sincere Muslims? Give us an answer if you have any.¹

This stance of al-Kisrawī played a very pivotal role in some erudite members of the Shī'ah and their youth being attracted to him. Hence thousands of people followed him and took up the task of aiding him and propagating his views and his books.

However, he was killed by his Shī'ī counterparts before his views could become widely known.²

1 *Al-Tashayyū' wa al-Shī'ah* p. 66. This was cited previously but I recited here because of its importance and relevance.

2 See the references cited above regarding his biography. Someone informed me that he had some heretical views, I, however, did not come across substantial evidence that affirmed this. Probably this accusation was due to the propaganda of some of the Shī'ah against him. A person is judged by the books and works he has left behind, and I did not see in his books which I came across any manifestation of heresy. And his journals and papers did not reach me based on which I could have come to learn of that... Previously I cited the praise al-Mallāḥ has showered him with... And I did not cite here only that which is Ḥaqq and which gained a lot of support in the Shī'ī circles.

Moving on, the books of some contemporary Shī'ah scholars who outwardly advocate unity have surfaced of recent. And the actual objective of these books is to defend the dogma of the Shī'ah and proselytise for them in the lands of the Ahl al-Sunnah. In these books is contained the view that the Shī'ah do not revile the Ṣaḥābah, let alone excommunicate the three Khulafā', and that they revere the Companions of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ.

Thus al-Khunayzī says the following in his book *al-Da'wah al-Islāmiyyah ilā Waḥdah Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Imāmiyyah*:

بأن الإمامية- في هذا العصر- لا تمس كرامة الخلفاء البتة فهذه كتاباتهم، وهذه كتبهم تنفي علنا السب عن الخلفاء وتثني عليهم

The Imāmiyyah, of this era, do not target the probity of the Khulafā' at all. Here are their writings and here are their books, they openly deny the denigration of the Khulafā', in fact they praise them.¹

He further says:

وممن صرح بنفي السب محمد باقر أحد مشاهير المجتهدين في كربلاء في منظومته المطبوعة في بمبي قال:

عثمان والذي تولى أولا	فلا نسب عمرا كلا ولا
حكم به قضي الإمام الصادق	ومن تولى سبهم ففاسق

Amongst those who have denied the denigration is one of the prominent Mujtahids of Karbalā' Muḥammad Bāqir. He says the following in his poetry which was published in Mumbai:

We do not revile 'Umar. Never. Nor 'Uthmān and the one who assumed the Khilāfah first.

Whoever bears the onus of reviling them is an open sinner. This is a judgement passed by Imām al-Ṣādiq.

¹ *Al-Da'wah al-Islāmiyyah* 1/256-257.

Al-Khunayzī then adds:

ونحن أيم الله لا نسب	وعندنا فلا يحل السب
----------------------	---------------------

And according to us as well it is not permissible to revile. And by the oath of Allah we do not revile.

We also find that al-Khunayzī accords ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ the title ‘Amīr al-Mu’minīn’ and supplicates for him. Likewise he uses the title ‘Ummhāt al-Mu’minīn’ for ‘Ā’ishah and Ḥafṣah, and the title ‘Amīr al-Mu’minīn’ for Abū Bakr.¹

He also says:

إن جعفر الصادق يقول مفتخرا ولدني أبو بكر مرتين، لأن أمه أم فروة بنت القاسم بن محمد بن أبي بكر وأُمها بنت عبد الرحمن بن أبي بكر، فهي بكريّة أما وأباً.

Ja’far al-Ṣādiq would say with pride, “Abū Bakr gave birth to me twice.” This is because his mother was Umm Farwah the daughter of al-Qāsim ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr. And her mother was the daughter of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Bakr. Hence she belonged to the pedigree of Abū Bakr both paternally and maternally.

He likewise says:

إن من قضاء جعفر الصادق فسق من سب الثلاثة

Among the verdicts of Ja’far al-Ṣādiq is that a person who reviles the three Khulafā’ is an open sinner.²

Similarly, Aḥmad Mughniyah opines that the Shī’ah extol the virtues of ‘Umar and pray for the pleasure of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى to descend upon him. And to say that

1 *Al-Da’wah al-Islāmiyyah* 1/8.

2 *Ibid.* 1/9.

the Shī'ah vilify 'Umar, he says, is the most despicable of plots. He then reveals the reason for the existence of this attribution to the Shī'ah by saying:

إن المفرقين وجدوا في اتفاق الاسمين: عمر بن الخطاب الخليفة العظيم، عمر بن سعد قاتل الحسين ميدانا واسعا يتسابقون فيه في تشويه الحقيقة والدس على الشيعة بأحط أنواع الدس... وكان طبعيا أن يكون لعنة اللعنات عمر بن سعد، لأنه بطل الجريمة وقائد المجرمين الجبناء، ومن من المسلمين لا يلعن عمر بن سعد قاتل ابن بنت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم.

إن اولئك الأتمين المفرقين استغلوا كلمة عمر وقالوا: إن الشيعة تنال من خليفة النبي عمر بن الخطاب - رضي الله عنه - وإني في الوقت أثور فيه على الدساسين التجار أصحاب الغايات والمصالح الرخيصة لا أنكر وجود أفراد بالأمس من سواد الشيعة وبسطائها لا يفرقون بين هذين الاسمين، بل لا يعرفون أن في دنيا التاريخ الإسلامي عمرين تقيا شقيا.

The differentiators found very wide scope for excelling in distorting the reality and plotting against the Shī'ah in the most despicable of ways in the similarity of the names: 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb the great Khalīfah and 'Umar ibn Sa'd the murderer of al-Ḥusayn. Naturally the one upon who immense curses should descend is 'Umar ibn Sa'd due to him being the infamous hero of the crime and the commander of the cowardly perpetrators; for is there anyone among the Muslims who does not curse 'Umar ibn Sa'd the murderer of the son of the daughter of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ?

These sinful differentiators exploited the word "Umar" and claimed that the Shī'ah vilify the Khalīfah of Nabī ﷺ 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb. And whilst I am raging at these plotters and people driven by worthless motives and objectives, I do not deny that in the past there were some people from the community of the Shī'ah and their laity who did not differentiate between these two names, instead they did not even know that in the history of Islam there lived two 'Umars: the pious and the wretched.¹

Hence he feels that the similarity in names, the exploitation of the differentiating enemies of that and the existence of some ignorant Shī'ah in the past who did not

1 Aḥmad Mugniyyah: *al-Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq* p. 113-114.

differentiate between the two ‘Umars all were instrumental in the attribution of the denigration of ‘Umar to the Shī‘ah. As for the books of the Shī‘ah and their scholars, they have nothing to do with this accusation due to them seeing in him as the great and pure Khalīfah of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ.

Furthermore, a Shī‘ī scholar of Iraq migrated to Egypt in order to propagate Shī‘ism. For this purpose he opened a centre by the name ‘Jam‘iyyah Ahl al-Bayt’ and accorded himself the title ‘Imām of the Shī‘ah in the republic of Egypt’, notwithstanding that Shī‘ah had no presence in Egypt after the efforts of the great commander Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn al-Ayyūbī. Nonetheless, he published a book with the title *Taqdīr al-Imāmiyyah li al-Ṣaḥābah* (the veneration of the Imāmiyyah for the Ṣaḥābah) and therein he rejects the attributing cursing, vilifying and excommunicating Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and those followed them to the Shī‘ah.¹

He says:

إن الشيعة لو كفرتهما لكفرت عليا، لأنه بايعهما، وكفرت سلمان وعمارا لأنهما بايعوهما، بل إن سلمان تولى على المدائن لعمر. فكيف يتصور منه أن يلي لعمر لو كان يرى كفره.

The Shī‘ah would be necessarily excommunicating ‘Alī if they excommunicated them due to him pledging his allegiance to them. Likewise they would be automatically excommunicating Salmān and ‘Ammār due to them pledging allegiance as well. In fact Salmān assumed the governance of Madā’in for ‘Umar. Hence how can it be perceived that he accepted this position for ‘Umar if he considered him to be a disbeliever?²

He further says that the Shī‘ah believe in the Qur’ān and that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ have been praised in the Qur’ān. He then presents verse no. 100 of Sūrah Tawbah and verse no. 29 of Sūrah al-Faṭḥ as evidence. Thereafter, he presents some excerpts from *Nahj al-Balāghah* and *al-Ṣaḥīfah al-Sajjādiyyah* wherein the virtues

1 *Taqdīr al-Imāmiyyah li al-Ṣaḥābah* p. 36.

2 Ibid. p. 37-39.

of the Ṣaḥābah are mentioned.¹ He then goes on to present the statements of some of their contemporary scholars wherein they praise the Ṣaḥābah and draw evidence from the following statement of Bāqir al-Ṣadr:

إن الصحابة بوصفهم الطليعة المؤمنة والمستتيرة كانوا أفضل وأصلح بذرة لنشوء أمة رسالية، حتى إن تاريخ الإنسان لم يشهد جيلا عقائدياً أروع وأنبأ وأطهر من الجيل الذي أنشأه الرسول القائد

The Ṣaḥābah, in terms of them being the first batch of believers and seekers of light, were the best and most capable seed for the emergence of a nation purely based upon revelation. To the extent that the history of humanity has not witnessed a generation based on doctrinal foundations better and nobler than the generation prepared by the great commanding Messenger.²

And finally he ends of his discussion by saying:

إن من ينسب إليهم ذلك (سب الصحابة) فهو إما أن يكون خصماً سيئ النية، وإما لم يطلع على مذهب الشيعة إلا من خلال كتب خصومها ولم يتمكن من الاطلاع على كتب أصحاب المذهب نفسه

The person who attributes this (the denigration of the Ṣaḥābah) to the Shī'ah is one of two people: either he is an opponent who has sinister motives, or he is someone who did not come to learn of the dogma of the Shī'ah but from the books of their opponents without having any recourse to the books of the adherents of the dogma themselves.³

Likewise Muḥammad Jawwād Mugniyyah, the head of the Jā'farī tribunal, say in *Tafsīr al-Kāshif* that the Shī'ah do not denigrate the Ṣaḥābah, and in substantiation presents the following prayer (which is regarding the followers of the prophets) of 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn which appears in *al-Ṣaḥīfah al-Sajjādiyyah*:

1 Ibid. 39-42.

2 Ibid. p. 43-46. He gives reference to the book of Bāqir al-Ṣadr: *al-Tashayyū' Ṣāḥirah Ṭabī'iyyah* p. 80.

3 Ibid. 46-47.

اللهم وأصحاب محمد خاصة الذين أحسنوا الصحبة والذين أبلوا البلاء الحسن في نصره... وفارقوا
الأزواج والأولاد في إظهار كلمته، وقاتلوا الآباء والأبناء في تثبيت نبوته

O Allah! And the Companions of Muḥammad, especially those among them who were loyal in their companionship and strove passionately in supporting him. They parted with their spouses and children in order to uplift his message, and they fought against their fathers and sons in establishing his prophethood.¹

Commenting on this he says:

هذه المناجاة جاءت في الصحيفة السجادية التي تعظمها الشيعة وتقدس كل حرف منها، وهي رد مفحم
لمن قال: إن الشيعة ينالون من مقام الصحابة

This prayer appears in al-Ṣaḥīfah al-Sajjādiyyah which the Shī'ah hold in great esteem and every letter of which they sanctify.² It is indeed an unequivocal refutation of those who claim that the Shī'ah belittle the status of the Ṣaḥābah.³

Many other contemporaries have expressed similar positions on this topic.⁴

1 *Al-Ṣaḥīfah al-Sajjādiyyah* p. 43-44.

2 Ibn Taymiyyah has said that most of this alleged al-Ṣaḥīfah, which they attribute to 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn and every letter whereof they sanctify, are lies forged upon him. (*Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/209).

3 *Tafsīr al-Kāshif* 10/515.

4 Like Ḥusayn Yūsuf Makkī al-'Āmilī who says:

لا نسوغ لأحد أن يسيبها (يعني الشيخين) ولا أن يتحامل على مقامها، ولا أفئتنا لأحد بجواز سبها. فلها عندنا من المقام ما يقتضي
الإحلال والاحترام، وإننا نحرص كل الحرص على تدعيم قواعد المودة والإلفة بين المسلمين

We do not allow anyone to revile them (Abū Bakr and 'Umar) nor to attack their integrity. We have similarly not issued a Fatwā of it being permissible to revile them. For they hold such high status as to be deserving of respect. And we are always desirous of strengthening the bonds of love and unity among the Muslims. (*'Aqīdah al-Shī'ah fī al-Imām al-Ṣādiq* [Beirut: Dār Al-Andalus, first edition] p. 19. Also see p. 30 of the previous reference).

And Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā' says:

وصحابة النبي الكرام أسمى من أن تخلق إلى أوج مقامهم بغاث الأوهام
And the status of the noble Ṣaḥābah of Nabī ﷺ is loftier than can be reached by the birds of assumptions. (*Aṣl al-Shī'ah* p. 113).

Analyses:

Has the stance of the contemporary Shī'ah changed regarding the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ?

Is what was presented reality or is it just another manifestation of Taqiyyah and superfluous flattery?

We say to al-Khunayzī, Aḥmad Mugniyyah, al-Rifā'ī, Muḥammad Jawwād Mugniyyah, and all those who display their veneration for the Ṣaḥābah, do not vilify them, and supplicate for them that those are very pleasant words which shower on our hearts coolness and serenity. We are always open to this unifying and consolidating spirit among the Muslims, and thus our hearts are always open to every word which unites and does not divide. We express our jubilation at all those honest attempts which aim at eliminating all those blasphemies and dark records heaped against the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

But, at the same time, is al-Khunayzī and the others not aware that the present libraries of the Shī'ah have published books which are filled with the denigration, criticism, and excommunication of the noblest Companions of Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ? Why do they still assert that the Shī'ah of today do not revile and that they consider reviling Abū Bakr and 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا to be a sin?

Here we have before us a Shī'ī scholar Ḥusayn al-Khurāsānī who wrote the book *al-Islām 'alā Ḍaw' al-Tashayyu'* and gifted it to Dār al-Taqrīb in Cairo. Upon the jacket of the book it is stated that it has been translated in three languages: Arabic, Persian, and English and that it received the approbation of the Iranian ministry of education. In this book he mentions:

تجوز الشيعة لعن الشيخين أبي بكر وعمر وأتباعهما، فإنما فعلوا ذلك أسوة لرسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم واقتفاء لأثره فإنهم ولا شك - كما يفترى - قد أصبحوا مطرودين من حضرة النبوي - كذا - وملعونين من الله تعالى بواسطة سفيره

The Shī'ah have, in allowing the cursing of Abū Bakr, 'Umar and their followers, followed the precedent of Rasūl Allāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and treaded his

path.¹ For Indeed they were banished from the presence of the Prophet and were cursed by Allah ﷻ via his Messenger.²

See how, not one of their laity, but one of their Āyāt openly proclaims that the position of Shī'ah is cursing and excommunicating the two greatest individuals of this Ummah and the most virtuous of people after the Ambiyā'; and that it is based upon the directive of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ to his Ummah to follow him; and that they consider cursing them to be endorsed by Dīn and Sharī'ah. So how can these scholars deny the existence of such denigration despite it containing emphatic curses and excommunication and being published in various languages?

Furthermore, I came across a supplication book of theirs which has been sanctioned by six of their scholars, each of who describe the book as 'a great sign', among them is al-Khū'ī, Khomeini, and Sharī'atmadārī. In this book is contained a supplication in Arabic which is two pages long and in it you will find curses upon Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and their daughters—the honourable mothers of the believers—'Ā'ishah and Ḥafṣah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا. A portion of this supplication reads as follows:

اللهم العن صنمي قريش وجبتيها وطاغوتيها، وإفكيها، وابنتيهما الذين خالفوا أمرك وأنكروا حيك وجحدا
إنعامك وعصيا رسولك وقلبا دينك وحرفا كتابك وأحبا أعدائك وجحدا آلائك -كذا- وعظلا أحكامك،
وألحدا في آياتك

O Allah curse the two people who were the idols of Quraysh, their devils and their lies. And (Curse) their daughters. They opposed Your command, rejected Your revelation, denied Your bounty, disobeyed Your Prophet, altered Your Dīn, distorted Your book, befriended Your enemies, rejected Your boons, destroyed Your injunctions and perpetrated blasphemies in your verses.³

1 *Al-Islām 'alā Ḍaw' al-Tashayyu'* p. 88 (footnote).

2 *Ibid.* p. 88.

3 Manṣūr Ḥusayn: *Tuḥfah al-'Awwām Maqbūl* p. 423-424. You can find the entire supplication in my book *Fikrah al-Taqrīb* under the addendum of documents.

This is how these scholars encourage every Shī' upon the face of the earth to make this supplication and deem it an act of devotion before Allah in order to implant hatred and malice in his heart against the best generations of humans and their followers till the Day of Judgment; and in order to place as many obstacles and hindrances as they can in the way of mutual agreement and unity; And in order to assure that their falsity does not become exposed, which is why they continue to deceive themselves and others by claiming that they do not vilify and by saying “let’s unite and support each other”!

Thus the Shī'ah have not given up reviling and cursing the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. A group of their scholars still continue to proclaim this misguidance and in following them the commonality also continue to revile and excommunicate.

After having visited the lands of the Shī'ah in Iran and Iraq, and after having attended their gatherings and circles of learning which they form in their houses, Masjids and seminaries, and learning of what really happens in the real world of the Shī'ah, Shaykh Mūsā Jār Allāh has revealed to us the following:

كان أول شيء سمعته وأكرهته هو لعن الصديق والفاروق وأمّهات المؤمنين السيدة عائشة والسيدة حفصة ولعن العصر الأول كافة. وكنت أسمع هذا في كل خطبة وفي كل حفلة ومجلس في البداية والنهاية وأقرأه في دياييج الكتب والرسائل وفي أدعية الزيارات كلها حتى في ألاسقية ما كان يسق ساق إلا ويلعن، وما كان يشرب شارب إلا ويلعن. وأول كل حركة وكل عمل هو الصلاة على محمد وآل محمد واللعن على الصديق والفاروق وعثمان الذين غصبوا حق علي وظلموه، حتى أصبح السب واللعن عندهم أعرف معروف يلتذ به الخطيب ويفرح عند السامع وترتاح إليه الجماعة.

The first thing I heard and despised was the curses against al-Ṣiddīq, al-Fārūq, the Mothers of the Believers, ‘Ā’ishah and Ḥaḥṣah, and the all the people of the first century. I used to hear this in the beginning and the end of every sermon, gathering and circle. And I used to read this in the prefaces of books, in small booklets, and in the prayers offered upon all the visitations (of the tombs and shrines). Even where water was being served, a server would not serve but after cursing and a consumer would consume but with cursing. At the beginning of every activity and action is sending salutation upon Muḥammad and his household, and cursing Abū

Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān who usurped the right of 'Alī and wronged him. Hence cursing has become the most 'well-known good', which the lecturer enjoys, the listeners enjoy and with which the congregation is at ease.¹

This dark reality wherein curses and statements of excommunication flow from the tongues of those who love it, is not surprising regarding a person who has fed upon the hatred of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم from his very childhood, and who is taught that whatever difficulties he encounters are all because of them. This is further entrenched in him with the processions and plays which take place every year wherein the 'oppression that the Ahl al-Bayt' which they suffered at the hands of Ṣaḥābah, as they allege, is depicted. The author of *al-Washī'ah* has alluded to some of what he saw in this regard and thereafter concluded that these processions and plays are filled with inciting hatred and enmity,² in fact they are a locus for implanting ill feelings and dislike for the people of the best century and their followers.

This is not from the doings of their simpletons, but from that of their scholars and Āyāt who instigate their followers to do so and propel them to it by using different incentives. In this regard, the following question was posed to their scholar Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā':

ما يقول مولانا حجة الإسلام... في المواكب المشجية التي اعتاد الجعفريون اتخاذها في العشر من المحرم تمثيلا لفاجعة الطف وإعلاما لما انتهك فيها من حرمة الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم في عترته المجاهدين بالتمثيل للشهداء وجهادهم، وما جرى على الأطفال من القتل والقسوة، وإعلانهم الحزن لذلك بأنواعه من ندب، ونداء، وعويل، وبكاء، وضرب بالأكف على الصدور وبالسلاسل على الظهر. فهل هذه الأعمال مباحة في الشرع أم لا أفوتونا مأجورين

What is the view of our master, the evidence of Islam... regarding the sorrowful processions which the Ja'farīs routinely lead in the ten days of Muḥarram in order to: mimic the tragedy of *Ṭaf* (Karbalā'); to provide information regarding the sanctity of Rasūl Allāh صلی الله علیه و آله which was desecrated by ill-treating his striving family and their efforts, and

1 Mūsā Jār Allāh: *al-Washī'ah* p. 27.

2 Ibid. p. 26.

regarding the massacre and atrocities which befell them and their children; and to express their grief upon all that by mourning, shouting, screaming, wailing, and flagellating oneself with the hands upon the chest and with chains upon the backs. Are these actions permissible in Sharī'ah or not. Please give us a fatwā, may you be rewarded.

And he responded with the following:

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ ذَلِكَ وَمَنْ يُعْظِمَ شَعَائِرَ اللَّهِ فَإِنَّهَا مِنْ تَقْوَى الْقُلُوبِ لَكُمْ فِيهَا مَنَافِعُ إِلَى أَجَلٍ مُّسَمًّى وَلَا رَيْبَ أَنَّ تِلْكَ الْمَوَاقِبَ الْمُحْزَنَةَ وَتَمَثِيلَ هَاتِيكَ الْفَاجِعَةِ الْمَشْجِيَةِ مِنْ شَعَائِرِ الْفِرْقَةِ الْجَعْفَرِيَّةِ

In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Berciful. That [is so]. And whoever honours the symbols [i.e., rites] of Allah – indeed, it is from the piety of hearts. For you therein are benefits for a specified term.¹ Indeed these sorrowful processions and the personification of that catastrophic tragedy are from the greatest symbols of the Ja'farī sect.²

Hence he considers this grave innovation, which is characteristic of the greatest falsehood, to be from the symbols of Allah. If this is the view of their eminent scholar then what do you think will be the view of those inferior to him? Notwithstanding that in it is contained: punishing oneself, killing, excommunicating the Muslims—specifically the Ṣaḥābah and their successors—wailing, slapping the cheeks, ascribing partners to Allah by calling on to the creation, etc., all of which are categorically known to be false in Islam.

Despite all of this, their scholar Muḥsin al-Amīn boasts that he established a gathering of condolences in Damascus which was attended by a large amount of people and was terminated with very effective and inductive slapping.³

These actions which they perform every year in the month of Muḥarram have no other theme besides reviling the Ṣaḥābah and openly ascribing partners to Allah.

1 Sūrah al-Ḥajj: 32, 33.

2 Al-Āyāt al-Bayyināt p. 5.

3 Rasā'il al-Tanzih li A'māl al-Shabīh p. 30.

Hence you will hear them chanting: “O Ḥusayn, O Ḥusayn”. And you will hear them showering curses upon the first generation in general and the first three Khulafā’ in specific. As a result, such hatred is implanted in their hearts which knows no bounds. It is for this reason that you will see their contemporaries writing about the alleged clash between the Ahl al-Bayt and the Ṣaḥābah, they write about it as though it is occurring at this very moment and as though it is a danger which has engulfed the Ummah and threatens its existence.

Having said this, besides the aforementioned, there are other avenues and sources through which the Shī’ah incessantly revile the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and excommunicate them. And their scholars support them in this deviance and encourage them without any shortfall. Hence from among these current avenues and sources which do not give birth but to the colocynth plants and do not implant but disunity, hatred and ill feelings are the following:

Firstly, up to the present moment there is an active Shī’ī movement which aims at rediscovering the lost Shī’ī heritage, publishing it, and making it popular amidst the people. This heritage is filled with cursing, excommunicating, and dooming to hell the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār with whom Allah was pleased and who were happy with Allah, especially the three Khulafā’ and the remaining ‘Asharah Mubashshrah, with the exception of Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī.¹

So how can it be claimed that the Shī’ah of today do not revile the Ṣaḥābah when they have revived those dark pages in a new form and spread them among their followers without any analyses or criticism?

Secondly, there still remains among their contemporaries a group of scholars which has dedicated itself to this falsehood. Hence their only concern in whatever they write and publish is to revile the men of the first generation and impugn them as though the Shī’ah of this time have no other concern. There are thus books dedicated to this topic which, in their crudeness and vulgarity, have surpassed what appears in their ancient books. For example, the book *al-Ghadīr* of

1 Whereas indirectly Amīr al-Mu’minīn has also become a victim of many of those accusations, as is clear to one who contemplates over their texts.

their contemporary scholar ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Amīnī al-Najafī. This book is filled with accusations, lies, and criticisms regarding those who were pleased with Allah and with whom Allah was pleased. And many of their scholars have written positive reviews on it.

His attack on the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and specifically on the rightly guided Khalīfah ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رضي الله عنه attained the admiration of some of the enemies of the Ummah. So for example you will notice this in the words of Bolas Salāmah, a Christian poet, who this Shī‘ī requested to write a review in the introduction of the seventh volume of his book. He thus wrote such words wherein he expresses his admiration and envy at what this liar drummed up against the Ummah and its Dīn. Just as he expresses his support for his inflammatory attack against the Fārūq of this Ummah and its great and guided Khalīfah ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رضي الله عنه whose conquests and accomplishments in spreading Islam agonized the enemies of Islam and remained a source of their perturbation up to the present day.¹

1 This Rāfiḍī commenced the seventh volume of his book with the remarks of this Christian. In response the latter wrote to him:

وقد شرفتموني بإدراج رسالتي في المقدمة. وقد اطلعت على هذا السفر النفيس فحسبت أن لآل البحار قد اجتمعت في غديركم... ولقد لفت نظري على الأخص ما ذكرتموه بشأن الخليفة الثاني. فلهه دركم ما أقوى حجتكم

You have honoured me by including my letter in the introduction. And I came to learn of this valuable book and it occurred to me that the pearls of *al-Biḥār* (ocean) have gathered in your *Ghadīr* (pond)...

And what specifically caught my attention is what you have mentioned regarding the second Khalīfah. For Allah is your goodness, how strong are your proofs. (*al-Ghadīr* vol. 7: p. ح)

And this simple-minded Rāfiḍī, or rather this heretic who masquerades as a Muslim was misled by the praise of this disbeliever and thus returned his praise by saying the following regarding his letter:

أنا من بحانة المسيحيين القاضي الحر والشاعر النبيل الأستاذ بولس سلامة... الخالد الذكر فشكرا له ثم شكرا

A letter has come to us from the research scholar of the Christians, the lofty judge and the noble poet, professor Bolas Salāmah... whose praise will remain forever. Thanks to him and thanks to him again. (*Al-Ghadīr* 7: p. ح).

See how this Rāfiḍī on the one hand virulently attacks the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم with all sorts of flaws and criticisms and how on the other hand he praises the disbelievers and seeks to draw near to them. This has always been the way of the Shī‘ah from the bygone eras.

Another example is the book *Abū Hurayrah* of their scholar ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn Sharaf al-Dīn al-Mūsawī wherein he accuses the greatest narrator of Islam Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه with lying and hypocrisy, whereas at the same time he defends liars and fabricators like Jābir al-Ju‘fī¹ and others.²

Likewise the book *al-Saqīfah* of their scholar Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar wherein he portrays the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم as a group of people who have no aim but to conspire against Islam. So much so that he says:

مات النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم ولا بد أن يكون المسلمون كلهم (لا أدري الآن) قد انقلبوا على أعقابهم

Nabī صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم passed away and all the Muslims necessarily (I don’t know of the present) turned back on their heels.³

And there are many other books of this nature.⁴

1 *Al-Murāja‘āt* p. 75.

2 Like Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam, see *al-Murāja‘āt* p. 312, 313.

3 *Al-Saqīfah* p. 19. And he describes the senior Ṣaḥābah as conspirators against ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, see *al-Saqīfah* p. 85.

4 Like the book *al-Naṣṣ wa al-Ijtihād* of ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn Sharaf al-Dīn al-Mūsawī. In this book he tries to provide an excuse for the Ṣaḥābah in their opposition of the emphatic appointment of ‘Alī, but in doing so he presents an excuse filled with deceit and evil. He claims that they believed in the principle of segregating religion from the state and thus they did not adhere to the appointment. This is an open lie the falsity whereof is exposed by the praise of Allah and his Rasūl for them, their piety, their asceticism and their striving...

Another book is *al-Imām al-Ṣādiq wa al-Madhāhib al-Arba‘ah* of Asad Ḥaydar wherein he denigrates the Khulafā’ of the Muslims and forges lies against prominent scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah like Imām Aḥmad in order to support his dogma. He also discusses the alleged tragedies of the Ahl al-Bayt.

Similarly, another book is ‘*Alī wa Munāwī’ūhu* of Professor Nūrī Ja‘far. In the book he concocts a clash between ‘Alī and the Ṣaḥābah and alleges that it was a clash akin to the one that existed between Nabī صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم and the Quraysh. He then says:

وإذا كان النصر قد كتب للنبي في نزاعه مع مناويهم لا اعتصامهم بالأوثان، فإن النصر لم يكن في تناول الإمام لتقمص مناويهم رداء الإسلام

And whilst victory was destined for Nabī صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم in his struggle with his opponents due to them latching on to idols, victory was not achievable for the Imām due to his opponents disguising themselves with the garb of Islam. (*‘Alī wa Munāwī’ūhu* p. 12) *continued ...*

Thirdly, all those supplications which the Shī'ah repeat on a daily basis. They are not empty of curses against the best of this Ummah, its leaders, the beloveds of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ, his relatives in law, and some of his wives—the Mothers of the Believers. Their books which have been written recently on this topic are not unlike their ancient books, as you will find in the book *Mafātih al-Jinān* of the contemporary scholar 'Abbās al-Qummī and *Ḍiyā' al-Ṣāliḥīn* of Muḥammad al-Jawharī, amongst others.

Having studied all of this, is there any room for any other interpretation of the denial of these deniers other than Taqiyyah and lying.

Is al-Khunayzī who claims that the Shī'ah do not revile thus unaware of what their early and contemporary scholars have written on this topic? Al-Khunayzī himself has perpetrated the crime of reviling the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم; he impugns Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه¹ and thereafter claims that the excommunication and denigration of the Ṣaḥābah which features in *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* is closely matched with what appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*.² Indeed a claim which has no basis apart from the fact that he is just trying to look for some opening to justify their stance regarding the Ṣaḥābah. Had there really been in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* narrations similar to those found in *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* there would have been among the Ahl al-Sunnah those who would revile and excommunicate like the Shī'ah. But the man is desperate to prove his false belief in whichever way possible.

continued from page 1467

As you can see, their thinking has not changed from that of the heretics of the past even though the author holds a high qualification.

One of their strange publications is the book *al-Rasūl al-A'dham ma' Khulafā'ihī* of their scholar Mahdī al-Qurashī. In this book the author depicts, according to his imaginations and beliefs what will happen to Abū Bakr, 'Umar and the Ṣaḥābah on Judgement Day. He likewise concocts conversations and claims that they will take place between Nabī ﷺ and his Ṣaḥābah and in them he will take them to task regarding not pledging their allegiance to 'Alī.

1 *Al-Da'wah al-Islāmiyyah* 1/12.

2 Ibid. 1/5-14.

As for Shaykh Aḥmad Mugniyyah who avers that the Shī'ah curse 'Umar ibn Sa'd and not 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb and that the confusion is due to the similarity in their names, is he unaware of the fact that 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is a victim of curses and excommunication in the reliable books of the Shī'ah, at the forefront of which is *al-Kāfī*, *al-Bihār*, *Tafsīr al-Qummī*, *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī*, etc. as has passed already.¹

And has it slipped his attention that the Shī'ah of the present still follow this pattern deviating in it without realising, as we seen in the case of the authors of *al-Ghadīr*, *al-Saqīfah* and *al-Islām 'alā Ḍaw' al-Tashayyu'*?

In fact some of their scholars, who advocate Islamic unity are still steeped in this deviance and they still calumniate and utter these hurtful statements. Hence their scholar Muḥammad al-Khālīṣī, one of the senior authorities of the Shī'ah in Iraq and one of those who spearheads the calls for Islamic unity, creates suspicion and doubt regarding the īmān of Abū Bakr and 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا; he says:

وإن قالوا إن أبا بكر وعمر من أهل بيعة الرضوان الذين نص على الرضى عنهم القرآن في قوله لَقَدْ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ إِذْ يُبَايِعُونَكَ تَحْتَ الشَّجَرَةِ. قلنا لو أنه قال: لقد رضي عن الذين يبایعونك تحت الشجرة لكان في الآية دلالة على الرضى عن كل من بايع. ولكن لما قال: لقد رضي الله عن المؤمنين إذ يبایعونك فلا دلالة فيها إلا على الرضى عن محض الإيمان

And if they say that Abū Bakr and 'Umar are from the people of *Bay'ah al-Riḍwān* and the Qur'ān has emphatically announced the pleasure of Allah for them in the verse: "Indeed Allah was pleased with the believers when pledged to you under the tree."² We will say, "Had Allah said that he was pleased with all those who pledged to you under the tree, then the pleasure in the verse would be inclusive of all those who pledged. But the fact that he says, "Allah was pleased with the believers when they pledged to you, it only suggests being pleased with those who had pure īmān."³

1 See p. 723, onwards (add page number)

2 Sūrah al-Faṭḥ: p. 18.

3 Al-Khālīṣī: *Iḥyā' al-Sharī'ah fī Madhhab al-Shī'ah* 1/63-64.

This implies that Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما were not from those who had pure īmān and thus the pleasure of Allah did not include them according to this Rāfiḍī. Can there be a greater ill understanding than the one proposed here, i.e. the description of the Ṣaḥābah with īmān being evidence of the best among them not having īmān?

There are many other Shī‘ah who are just like al-Khālīsī in the present era.¹

So was all of this unknown to Aḥmad Mugniyyah, or he intended to deceive the Ahl al-Sunnah? Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَعَالَى knows best of the reality. And Taqiyyah has always been the problem of the Shī‘ah.

As for al-Rifā‘ī who claims that the Shī‘ah revere the Ṣaḥābah and that whoever attributes otherwise to them is an opponent with evil intent, is it hidden from him that it is their books which attribute this position to them, and that it is their scholars like al-Kulaynī, al-Qummī, al-‘Ayyāshī, al-Majlisī, and others who have documented this shameful position, not any opponent with evil intent or a person who is unaware of what appears in their books?

Furthermore, al-Rifā‘ī himself has referred to the *Biḥār* of al-Majlisī when writing his book *Taqdīr al-Imāmiyyah li al-Ṣaḥābah*;² that *Biḥār* which contains such denigration, cursing, and excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah that it causes the skin of the believers to shiver; that *Biḥār* in which the author establishes a chapter with the title *Chapter regarding the disbelief of the three*,³ i.e. the three Khulafā’ before ‘Alī. How can he then claim that the Shī‘ah revere the Ṣaḥābah? If he really believes in revering the Ṣaḥābah, he should propagate that in the circles of the Shī‘ah, not in Cairo. And he should strive to convince his Imāmī friends to change this problem which has pervaded all their books, or at least shun them and announce that they are baseless. As for rejecting that which exists, it does not serve any purpose in defending the Shī‘ī dogma due to it inevitably smacking

1 Shihāb al-Dīn ak-Najafī: in his footnotes on *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq* of al-Shustarī 2/ 291, and other sections.

2 See p. 15, 17, 19.

3 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 2/208-252.

off the conclusion of Taqiyyah for the Shī'ah and for those non-Shī'ah who have access to their books.

Likewise this al-Rifā'ī, who writes his book *Taqdīr al-Imāmiyyah li al-Ṣaḥābah* amidst the Ahl al-Sunnah in Cairo and outwardly displays ignorance for what appears in their ancient and contemporary works and for what actually happens in the real world of the laity and learned of Shī'ah, himself reviles prominent Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. Hence he says what he does not do and he denies what he knows. He accuses 'Umar, the Fārūq of this Ummah of conspiring against Islam and of being the first person to hold the view of Raj'ah.¹ He likewise denigrates Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and Abū 'Ubaydah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.²

What is further astonishing is that he draws evidence from the booklet *al-Tashayyū' Zāhirah Ṭabī'iyah fī Itār al-Da'wah al-Islāmiyyah* of Muḥammad Bāqir al-Ṣadr despite it being an unfruitful attempt to prove a legitimate foundation for the Rāfiḍī dogma. And despite it proposing the idea that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were not eligible for carrying and conveying the message of Rasūl Allāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and his Sharī'ah, and that 'Alī alone was eligible for bearing them and conveying them. This idea, aside from it impugning the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, is a foolish and ignorant idea, or at least it is a spiteful one which endeavours to attack the pristine Sunnah and the *Tawātur* (mass transmission in all generations) of this Dīn. This idea proposes that the transmission of an individual is superior to the transmission of an entire group. This in a way endorses the doctrine of the infallibility of the Imāms and the excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.

As for the alleged praise for the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ which he quotes from the booklet of al-Ṣadr, it was actually said by al-Ṣadr in order to mislead the reader into accepting what he was to forge against them thereafter. Al-Rifā'ī thus very cunningly omits the opening and the end of his statement due to it debunking his substantiation therefrom. Hereunder is what al-Ṣadr says:

1 See his footnotes on the book *al-Tashayyū'* of Muḥammad Bāqir al-Ṣadr: p. 30-31.

2 Ibid. p. 46.

وبالرغم من أن الصحابة بوصفهم الطليعة المؤمنة كانوا أفضل وأصلح بذرة لنشوء أمة رسالية... بالرغم من ذلك نجد من الضروري التسليم بوجود اتجاه واسع منذ كان النبي حيا يميل إلى تقديم الاجتهاد في تقدير المصلحة واستنتاجها من الظروف على التعبد بحرفية النص الديني، وقد تحمل الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم المראה في كثير من الحالات بسبب هذا الاتجاه

Despite the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, in terms of them being the first generation of believers, being the best and the most capable seed for laying the foundation of a nation based on the message of Risālah... despite this, it is important to acknowledge that there was during the lifetime of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم a widespread notion which inclined toward giving credence to Ijtihād in ascertaining benefit and deducing it from the situations over rigidly following the religious text. It was owing to this that Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم had to suffer much of its bitterness in many conditions.¹

Do you see any praise in this text? He claims that the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم would give preference to Ijtihād despite the existence of emphatic religious texts; rather they would abandon the orders of Rasūl Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and would follow their own interests. Is this venerating the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم? It is a well-established principle that it is not permissible to do Ijtihād in the presence of emphatic texts and that opposing Rasūl Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم is a major crime. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

فَلْيَحْذَرِ الَّذِينَ يُخَالِفُونَ عَنْ أَمْرِهِ أَنْ تُصِيبَهُمْ فِتْنَةٌ أَوْ يُصِيبَهُمْ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ

So let those beware who dissent from his [i.e., the Prophet's] order lest fitnah strike them or a painful punishment.²

All these claims of this Rāfiḍī are thus in order to support his false assertions, i.e. the assertion that 'Alī رضي الله عنه was emphatically nominated as the successor and that the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم shunned adhering to that due to their personal interest. But really, was there any benefit for them in pledging allegiance to Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه?

1 Al-Tashayyu' p. 80.

2 Sūrah al-Nūr: 63.

This Rifā'ī does not merely suffice on quoting from the booklet of al-Ṣadr, but he spreads the falsehood contained therein and adorns it with his supportive review. He then writes in another book that the Imāmiyyah revere the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. What reverence is this? Unless reverence according to them entails reviling, cursing and excommunicating.

How bold are these people in speaking lies!

As for Muḥammad Jawwād Mugniyyah who claims that the Shī'ah do not disrespect the Ṣaḥābah and substantiates his claim with the verdict of 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, to him I say that you people did not follow the advice dispensed by 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn. Because he, as you acknowledge and report from him, would invoke the mercy of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى for the Ṣaḥābah, may Allah be pleased with them all; but you have not followed your Imām, nor did you prove to be true and consistent in your speech. This Mugniyyah who writes these words is the very same person who, in his book *Fī Zīlāl Nahj al-Balāghah*, says the following regarding the guided Khalīfah Dhū al-Nūrayn, the generous, the modest, the son-in-law of Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ due to marrying his two daughters, the one who prepared the *Jaysh al-'Usrah* (the army of poverty), the one who emigrated in both the emigrations, and the one who was given glad tidings of Jannah from Rasūl Allāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ:

إن عثمان انحرف عن سنة الرسول وخالف شريعة الإسلام، واستأثر هو وذووه بأموال المسلمين فامتلكوا القصور والمزارع والرياش والخيول والعبيد والإماء ومن حولهم ملايين الجياع والمعدمين

Surely 'Uthmān deviated from the Sunnah of Rasūl صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and opposed the Sharī'ah of Islam. He gave preference to himself and his associates in the wealth of the Muslims, hence they took possession of palaces, orchards, furniture, horses, slaves and concubines whilst around them were millions of hungry and impoverished people.¹

He also says:

1 *Fī Zīlāl Nahj al-Balāghah* 2/264.

وكان الزبير وطلحة وعائشة وراء ما حدث لعثمان وعليهم تقع التبعة في دمه

And Zubayr, Ṭalḥah, and ‘Ā’ishah were behind what happened to ‘Uthmān;
upon them is the blame of his blood.¹

He also accuses ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the members of the Shūrā to whom ‘Umar had accorded the prerogative of nominating the next Khalīfah after him of deception and conspiracy.²

Where is the respect for the status of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ when this speech which is filled with hatred is directed toward the best among them? And can Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ be more offended than by offending him due to denigrating his wives, his relatives-in-law, and his prominent Companions?

After all of this, how do we interpret this glaring contradiction of the Shī’ah? Is it a result of Taqiyyah for Taqiyyah according to them constitutes nine tenths of Dīn, and a person who does not practice it has no Dīn, or is it all just a ploy to proselytise Shī’ism?

Before ending off this discussion, I shall endeavour to disclose some crucial realities and some hidden secrets regarding their praise for the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ; they are of such a nature that a person who does not consistently study their works and does not ponder over their ways and terms will never be able to pick them up.

The Reality of the Praise of the Shī’ah for the Ṣaḥābah

These Shī’ah claim that they love the Ahl al-Bayt and are loyal to them but in reality only intend their Twelve Imāms. As for the others, especially those who revolted against the rulers in order to attain rulership, they disrespect them and even denigrate them, impugn them, and consider them doomed to Jahannam. In a like manner, they claim at times that they respect the Ṣaḥābah but they actually

1 Ibid. 1/292-293.

2 Ibid. 2/ 2-3.

only intend three, four or seven amongst them who did not turn renegade according to their fables.

A person who does not know this reality will probably be deceived by their words and will never think that they hold a specific meaning for the term ‘Ṣaḥābah’.

Then there is another meaning of the term ‘Ṣaḥābah’ according to them and this meaning appears in some of their narrations. After praising the Ṣaḥābah and instructing the Ummah to refer to their views and consensus, their narrations mention that Rasūl Allāh ﷺ was asked, “Who are your Companions?” to which he responded, “My Ahl al-Bayt.”¹ Hence they interpret the term ‘Ṣaḥābah’ to mean ‘Ahl al-Bayt’.

There is also another approach which they adopt when praising the Ṣaḥābah, and that is Taqiyyah. Their scholar al-Ṭūsī has alluded to this, he says the following after denigrating Umm al-Mu’minīn ‘Ā’ishah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا:

فإن قيل أليس قد روي عن أبي جعفر محمد بن علي الباقر أن سائلا سأله عن عائشة وعن مسيرها في تلك الحرب، فاستغفر لها وقال له الراوي: تستغفر لها وتتولاها فقال: نعم، أما علمت ما كانت تقول يا ليتني كنت شجرة ليتني كنت مدرة. قال الطوسي: لا حجة في ذلك على مذاهبننا لأننا نجيز عليه صلوات الله عليه التورية، ويجوز أن يكون السائل من أهل العداوة واتقاء بهذا القول وروى فيه تورية يخرج من أن يكون كذبا، وبعد فإنه علق توبتها بتمنيها أن تكون شجرة ومدرة وقد بينا أن ذلك لا يكون توبة وهو عليه السلام بهذا أعلم

If it is said, “Has it not been narrated from Abū Ja’far Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Bāqir that when a questioner asked him regarding ‘Ā’ishah and her participation in that battle he sought forgiveness for her? And when the narrator asked him, ‘Do you seek forgiveness for her and associate with her?’ He replied in the affirmative and said, ‘Do you not know what she would say: ‘I wish I was a tree, I wish I was a piece of clay.’” [Al-Ṭūsī says,] There is no evidence in this against our dogma. Because we consider it possible for him عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام to have practiced dissimulation. And likewise it is possible that the questioner was from the enemy owing to which

1 See p. 762 (add page number)

the Imām defended himself with this statement and narrated therein a narration under Taqiyyah without speaking a lie. After all, he suspended her repentance upon her desire to be a tree and a piece of clay, and, as we have mentioned, that is not enough for repentance and he عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام is more aware of that.¹

Therefore, it is the responsibility of those who claim that the Shī'ah venerate the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ to openly mention the errant nature of these approaches, acknowledge the falsity of those evil narrations, speak the truth and not contradict themselves in order for their position to be accepted from them.

Furthermore, why do these people go about rejecting the claims of the Ahl al-Sunnah when they say that the position of the Shī'ah is to impugn the Ṣaḥābah and excommunicate them, but they do not refute themselves, their books, and their contemporary scholars who still blurt this deviance.

And what benefit remains today in cursing, reviling, and excommunicating the Ṣaḥābah, with which they have filled their books, their market places, and their shrines; when the first era has passed already with everything that it entailed? The only apparent reason is to attack the Qur'ān, the Sunnah, and the Dīn in general; and to instigate mayhem and disunite the Ummah.

And what remains of our history and our glories if that first generation of pious, selected, and loyal leaders who spread Islam, established its empire, conquered lands, guided the bondsmen, erected a civilisation unprecedented in the history of humanity, and spearheaded all efforts of goodness, justice, and virtue; deserve to be cursed by their successive generations, and if their history is distorted, whereas they are the people who Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and His Rasūl صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ have praised and their merits and accolades honest history has documented with ink of light. Is there anyone then who deserves praise and acknowledgement? And what would be our history and our glory if this is their condition?

1 Al-Ṭūsī: *al-Istifā' fī al-Imāmah* p. 288 (of the manuscript).

Discussion 6: 'Iṣmah (Infallibility)

What is new regarding the stance of the contemporary scholars in this regard is that they have adopted the view of their later scholars in claiming absolute infallibility for the Imāms, a view that represents the highest level of extremism due to it entailing that the Imāms do not falter and forget.

This specific view was treated by the Shī'ah of the fourth century as an extremist radical view. To the extent that their scholar Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, the author of *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh*, has stated that the sign of extremism is negating forgetfulness from the Imāms. He says:

إن الغلاة والمفوضة ينكرون سهو النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم

The extremist and the consigners do not believe in the forgetting of Nabī

¹ صلى الله عليه وسلم

Hence, likewise will be the case of those who negate forgetfulness from the Imāms.

Their scholar al-Majlisī concedes that many of their narrations indicate to the fact that their Imāms would at times forget.² But their later scholars did not worry about that and unanimously opposed it by believing that the Imāms are free from forgetfulness. It is for this reason that al-Majlisī admits that this is a very contentious issue;³ i.e. he realised that many of his friends agreed upon opposing their copious narrations in this regard.

The contemporaries have treaded the path of the later scholars in opposing the narrations of the Shī'ah and what their senior scholars have said. We thus find one of their cotemporary scholars 'Abd Allah al-Mamaqānī, also known as

1 Ibn Bābawayh: *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh* 1/234.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* 25/351.

3 Ibid.

al-Āyah al-‘Udhmā (the greatest sign) emphasising that rejecting the infallibility of the Imāms is to reject a categorically established aspect of the Shī‘ī dogma.¹ Surprisingly, he does not deny the fact that amongst their early scholars there were those who considered this to be extreme, but he comments:

إن ما يعتبر غلوا في الماضي أصبح اليوم من ضرورات المذهب

That which was considered to be extreme in the past has become an incontrovertible aspect of the dogma.²

This view that the Imāms are infallible is repeatedly emphasised by their scholars. Hence al-Muẓaffar considers it to be a firmly established principle of the Imāmiyyah without even hinting to any dispute amongst the Shī‘ah regarding it.³ Al-Khunayzī, in his book *al-Da‘wah al-Islāmiyyah ilā Waḥdah Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Imāmiyyah*, emphasises upon it without any Taqiyyah;⁴ and Khomeini, in his book *al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah*, negates even the possibility of the Imāms forgetting.⁵

Where on the one hand the claim of infallibility for the Imāms equates them to Rasūl Allah ﷺ in their verdicts and actions,

وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ ۖ إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَىٰ

By the star when it descends, your companion [i.e., Muhammad] has not strayed, nor has he erred.⁶

On the other hand the claim that they do not forget/err or that it is inconceivable for them to forget/err is equivalent to deifying them. This is clearly understood from the following statement of Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī:

1 Al-Mamaqānī: *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* 3/240.

2 Ibid.

3 ‘Aqā’id al-Imāmiyyah p. 95.

4 *Al-Da‘wah al-Islāmiyyah* 1/92.

5 *Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 91.

6 Sūrah al-Najm: 2.

إن الله أسهى نبيه ليعلم أنه بشر مخلوق فلا يتخذ ربا معبودا دونه

Allah made his Nabī forget so that it becomes known that he was a created human and thus is not thereafter treated as a deity besides Allah.¹

Furthermore, Ibn Bābawayh and other scholars of the fourth century considered the rejection of these narrations, i.e. the narrations of the forgetting of Nabī ﷺ, to amount to nullifying the Dīn and the Sharī'ah completely. Ibn Bābawayh says:

ولو جاز أن ترد الأخبار الواردة في هذا المعنى لجاز أن ترد جميع الأخبار، وفي ردّها إبطال الدين والشرعة، وأنا أحسب الأجر في تصنيف كتاب منفرد في إثبات سهو النبي صلى الله عليه وآله والرد على منكره إن شاء الله تعالى

If it is possible to reject narrations with such content it would likewise be possible to reject all the narrations. And in rejecting them is the nullification of Dīn and the Sharī'ah. I am hopeful of reward in writing an exclusive book on the forgetfulness of Nabī ﷺ and so am I hopeful of reward in rebutting the claims of those who deny it, if Allah wills.²

However, the later scholars and the contemporary scholars did not pay any heed to the view of Ibn Bābawayh. They likewise did not pay heed to his denial of their erroneous belief of interpolation and to any view or voice which opposed what the scholars of the Safawid Empire agreed upon.

The contemporary scholars have, as represented by al-Mamaqānī, considered the denial of forgetfulness from Nabī ﷺ to be an integral aspect of the Shī'ī dogma. And their scholar Muḥsin al-Amīn has affirmed that whoever denies a categorical aspect of the Shī'ī dogma is a disbeliever according to them.³

1 *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh* 1/234.

2 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 17/111.

3 Muḥsin al-Amīn: *Kashf al-Irtiyāb*: the 2nd introduction. This is also established in their book *Muḥadhdhab al-Aḥkām* 1/388-393.

This necessarily implies that their later scholars excommunicate their earlier scholars due to them denying a categorical aspect of the Shīʿī dogma. Just as it implies that the later scholars are victims of the curses of their early scholars due to them adopting the viewpoint of the extremist Mufawwiḍah who were cursed by the Imāms.

Not only that, in the books which they publish and direct to the lands of the Ahl al-Sunnah we find¹ that the belief that the Imāms are infallible is the view of all the Shīʿah.² And surprisingly, in other books of the Shīʿah we find the view that the Shīʿah unanimously concur on rejecting the infallibility of the Imāms,³ and that rejecting it is a categorically established aspect of the Shīʿī dogma.⁴

So who do we believe and who is actually representing the Shīʿī dogma?

This is how the Shīʿah excommunicate each other and contradict each other; each one claims that what he says is the official viewpoint of the cult.

1 Like in the writings of Muḥammad Jawwād Muḡniyyah wherein we find that he has ‘freed himself’ from much of the extremism of the Shīʿah and their fanaticism. But these books are spread in the lands of the Ahl al-Sunnah and thus the possibility of Taḡiyyah still stands.

2 Muḥammad Jawwād Muḡniyyah: *al-Shīʿah fī al-Mīzān* p. 272-273.

3 Muḥammad Āṣif al-Muḡsinī: *Shīʿat al-Ḥaqq* 3/121.

4 As has been presented already i.e. the view of al-Mamaqānī in *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*.

Discussion 7: Raj'ah (the return)

What is new in the position of the contemporaries regarding Raj'ah¹ is the emergence of a group of scholars amongst them who claim that there is no basis to the doctrine of Raj'ah, specifically those who outwardly spearhead the call for unity and building common understanding between the Shī'ah and the Ahl al-Sunnah. This group asserts the following:

فالحق الذي عليه المحققون هو أن لا رجعة سوى ظهور الإمام الثاني عشر

The viewpoint of the research scholars in this regard is that there is no Raj'ah, with the exception of the emergence of the Twelfth Imām.²

Whilst on the other hand there is another camp which does not deny it but avers that the issue of Raj'ah is not a core belief of their dogma; it is not a categorically established aspect thereof; it is not part of their beliefs; and it is not of any importance to them, even though mention of it appears in their narrations. Hāshim al-Ḥusaynī says:

إن الرجعة ليست من معتقدات الإمامية ولا من الضروريات عندهم

Raj'ah is not from the beliefs of the Imāmiyyah, nor is it from their categorically established beliefs.³

And Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā' says:

وليس الدين بالرجعة في مذهب التشيع بلازم وإنكارها بضار، وإن كانت ضرورية عندهم.

1 Raj'ah: The Shī'ī belief that Allah ﷻ will return, at the emergence of the Twelfth Imām, the Prophet ﷺ, the other Imāms, a group of loyal Shī'ah—so that they may witness and testify to his Imāmah—and also a number of supposed enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt in order to take revenge from them. [translator]

2 Al-Khunayzī: *al-Da'wah al-Islāmiyyah ilā Waḥdah Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Imāmiyyah* 2/94.

3 Hāshim al-Ḥusaynī: *al-Shī'ah bayn al-Ash'irah wa al-Mu'tazilah* p. 237.

Believing in Raj'ah is not compulsory in the Shīr dogma, and denying it is not detrimental even though it is categorically established.¹

He also says:

وليس لها (يعني) الرجعة عندي من الاهتمام قدر صغير أو كبير

And Raj'ah has no importance in my sight, not a little and not a lot.²

Probably the reader will pick up the contradiction in the aforementioned; and probably this contradiction is intended to suggest the possibility of Taqiyyah, as is their wont in circumlocuting in their speech; For how can it be categorically established despite belief in it not being compulsory, denying it not being detrimental, and despite it not having any importance, notwithstanding that the one who denies a categorically established aspect of their dogma is a disbeliever according to their scholars.³

Similar is the contradiction in the approach of Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar. He says:

إن الرجعة ليست من الأصول التي يجب الاعتقاد بها والنظر فيها

Raj'ah is not from the core beliefs in a manner that believing in it and deliberating over it is compulsory.⁴

Whereas on the other hand he says:

إن الرجعة من الأمور الضرورية فيما جاء عن آل البيت من الأخبار المتواترة

1 *Aṣl al-Shī'ah* p. 35.

2 *Ibid.* p. 36.

3 *Al-Sabzawārī: Muḥadhdhab al-Aḥkām* 1/ 388, onwards; Muḥsin al-Amīn: *Kaṣhf al-Irtiyāb*: the 2nd introduction.

4 *'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah* p. 113.

Raj'ah if from the categorically established aspects as it has been widely transmitted from the Ahl al-Bayt.¹

This is what the contemporaries have to say regarding Raj'ah: a group amongst them deny it; a group considers it to be secondary; and a group contradicts itself when mentioning their position regarding it; each one surprisingly claiming that what it says is the correct representation of Shī'ī dogma. So whose view should we accept? Despite each one of them consisting of senior scholars of the Twelvers, and despite them all belonging to the same era you find such discrepancies and contradictions in their views. Is this all a result of them practicing Taqiyyah due to learning that some scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah consider Raj'ah to be an extremist tendency? Which is why probably their scholar al-Muẓaffar says:

إن الاعتقاد بالرجعة من أكبر من تنبذ به الشيعة الإمامية ويشنع عليهم

Belief in Raj'ah is the greatest problem for which the Imāmiyyah are criticized and condemned.²

And whatever is as contentious as that, obviously Taqiyyah will be deployed when discussing it.

The books wherefrom these quotes were presented are all Shī'ī books which have been written to target the Ahl al-Sunnah, as is obvious from their introductions, their approach, and their style in presenting the Shī'ī beliefs.

However, you will find contemporary books of some of their scholars which still go to the extent of believing in Raj'ah and consider the rejecter thereof not to be a believer. Consider the following:

تضافرت الأخبار (يعني أخبارهم) ليس منا من لم يؤمن برجعتنا

1 Ibid. p. 113.

2 Ibid. p. 110.

The narrations jointly establish: He who does not believe in our Raj'ah is not from amongst us.¹

إن ثبوت الرجعة مما اجتمعت عليه الشيعة الحقّة والفرقة المحققة بل هي من ضرورات مذهبهم

The true Shī'ah and the rightful sect is unanimous upon the validity of Raj'ah. In fact it is from the categorically established aspects of their dogma.²

ومنكرها خارج من رتبة المؤمنين فإنها من ضرورات مذهب الأئمة الطاهرين

The one who rejects it is excluded from the position of the believers, for it is a categorically established belief in the dogma of the Imāms.³

Likewise al-Zanjānī says the following in his book 'Aqā'id al-Ithnay 'Ashariyyah:

إن اعتقادي... واعتقاد علماء الاثني عشرية قدس الله أسرارهم من أن الله تعالى يعيد عند ظهور الإمام الثاني عشر جماعة من الشيعة إلى الدنيا ليفوزوا بثواب نصرته ومشاهدة دولته. ويعيد جماعة من الظلمة والغاصبين والظالمين لحق آل محمد عليهم السلام لينتقم منهم.

My belief... and the belief of the Twelver scholars is that Allah ﷻ will return, at the emergence of the Twelfth Imām, a group of Shī'ah to the world so that they may attain the reward of aiding him and witnessing his empire. He will also return a group from the oppressors and the usurpers of the right of the Ahl al-Bayt in order to take revenge from them.⁴

He also says:

وظني أن من يشك في أمثالها فهو شاك في أئمة الدين

1 Ibrāhīm al-Zanjānī: 'Aqā'id al-Ithnay 'Ashariyyah (first publication) p. 240; 'Abd Allah Shibr: *Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn* 2/3.

2 'Aqā'id al-Ithnay 'Ashariyyah p. 239; *Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn* 2/3.

3 'Aqā'id al-Ithnay 'Ashariyyah p. 241.

4 Ibid. 239.

And my assumption is that the one who doubts something like it, actually doubts the Imāms of the dogma.¹

Nonetheless, how do we interpret this contradiction? Have they really differed so drastically on this issue, or have they made everything permissible with the belief of Taqiyyah? If we have to take everything literally we will reach the following conclusion: A group among them has freed itself from following the legacy and has rebelled against their fables despite the claims of them being widely transmitted and well established. The voice of this group, however, is suppressed and its effect is obliterated due to the dangerous belief of Taqiyyah. No reformer can ever make any impact upon this cult as long as Taqiyyah remains an integral part of its beliefs. As a result their dogma will be based on the views of the extremist, not upon the views of the balanced scholars, and with that upon the views of their scholars not upon the legacy of the Imāms.

Having said this, up to the present moment the various fictitious incidents which their fables foretell still repeatedly feature in their speeches. And aside from their fictitious nature, they smack off hidden emotions, defeated feelings, and suppressed hatred against this Ummah. A Shī'ī listens to these fictitious scenes of massacre which will play out in the alleged Raj'ah with extreme interest. Which is why he consistently prays to be part of this return in which the promised revenge will take place.²

1 Ibid. 240.

2 As you will find in the supplication which they term 'the supplication of 'Ahd'. It reads as follows:

اللهم إن حال بيني وبينه الموت الذي جعلته على عبادك حتماً مقضياً فأخرجني من قبري مؤثراً كفنني شاهراً سيفي مجرداً فقاتني ملياً
دعوة الداعي في الحاضر والبادي.

O Allah! If death, which you made an inevitable decree against your servants, becomes an obstacle between me and him, then take me out of my grave in a condition that I will adorn my winding sheet, unsheathe my sword, remove my spear and respond to the call of the caller, whether he be from the city or from the village.

(Al-Zanjānī: 'Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah al-Ithnay 'Ashariyyah p. 236. The author has considered this supplication a proof for the validity of Raj'ah)

Hence, despite the passage of centuries and the development of time, the sentiments of the contemporaries have not changed in this regard. Read the response one of their scholars gives regarding what will happen to the two rightful successors of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, his beloveds and his relatives-in-law, Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا, in the alleged Raj‘ah:

وأما مسألة نبش قبر صاحبي رسول الله وإخراجهما حيين وهما طريان وصلبهما على خشبة وإحراقهما، لأن جميع ما ارتكبه البشر من المظالم والجنايات والآثام من آدم إلى يوم القيامة منهما فأوزارهما عليهما، فمسألة عويصة جدا، وليس عندي شيء يرفع هذا الإشكال. وقد صح عن أئمتنا أن حديثنا صعب مستصعب.

As for the issue of exhuming the graves of the two Companions of Rasūl Allah, removing them from them fresh and alive, crucifying them upon a plank, and burning them due to them being responsible for all the oppression, crimes and evils from the time of Ādam till the Day of Judgment, it is indeed a very complex issue. And I do not have anything that can eliminate this objection. And it has been authentically proven from our Imāms that our narrations are difficult and very complex.

Can a person ever conceive that these type of myths find their way to such a scholar who has reached the level of the ‘grand Āyat’ and then too he does not take the courage to refute them and considers them to be very complex and difficult and resorts to another myth to answer them, and that is that their religion is difficult and very complex.

Without a doubt this difficult and complex religion can never be Islām. Because it opposes sound human disposition and can never be accepted by sound intellect due to it going against core fundamentals.

In conclusion, we say that the Shī‘ah are still steeped in the myth of Raj‘ah and whatever entails.

Discussion 8: Taqiyyah

Has any considerable change occurred in the viewpoint of the contemporaries regarding *Taqiyyah* (subterfuge) which could be worth documentation? Or has it not changed from what we have mentioned regarding their predecessors and from what features in their reliable books?

One of their contemporary scholars has said:

إن الأمر قد تغير... وإنه لا تقية اليوم عند الشيعة... لأن الشيعة إنما التزمت بالتقية بسبب الظلم والواقع عليها في العصور البائدة، أما وقد ارتفع الظلم فلا تقية ولا كذب ولا نفاق، بل صدق وصرحة ووضوح

Things have changed... There is no *Taqiyyah* today according to the *Shī'ah*... Because the *Shī'ah* only practiced *Taqiyyah* due to the oppression which was met out on them in the previous centuries. As for today, when oppression is alleviated, there is no *Taqiyyah*, lying or hypocrisy. Rather there should be truthfulness, transparency, and clarity.

Muḥammad Jawwād al-Mugniyah says the following:

إن التقية كانت عند الشيعة حيث كان العهد البائد عهد الضغط والطغيان، أما اليوم حيث لا تعرض للظلم في الجهر بالتشيع فقد أصبحت التقية خبر ما كان

Taqiyyah according to the *Shī'ah* was practiced due to the past era being pervaded by suppression and oppression. As for today, when there is no fear of oppression in openly proclaiming *Shī'ism*, *Taqiyyah* has become a phenomenon of the past.¹

He also says:

قال لي بعض أساتذة الفلاسفة في مصر: أنتم الشيعة تقولون بالتقية... فقلت له: لعن الله من أخرجنا إليها. اذهب الآن أني شئت من بلاد الشيعة فلا تجد للقية عينا ولا أثرا، ولو كانت دينا ومذهبا في كل حال لحافظوا عليها محافظتهم على تعليم الدين ومبادئ الشريعة

1 Mugniyah: *al-Shī'ah fī al-Mīzān* p. 52, 345; *Ahl al-Bayt* p. 66-67.

One of the teachers of philosophy in Egypt said to me, “You Shī‘ah believe in Taqiyyah...” so I said to him, “May Allah curse those who compelled us to deploy it. Go now to wherever you want in the lands of the Shī‘ah and you will not find any existence or effect of Taqiyyah. Had it been a religious practice they would have safeguarded it just as they safeguarded the other teachings of Dīn and principles of Sharī‘ah.”¹

Similar are the views of their other contemporary scholars who are described as *Marāji‘* (authorities) and *Āyāt* (signs of Allah); they all aver that Taqiyyah is only deployed at the time of need, i.e. when fear of death, loss of wealth, and desecration of honour is impending. They also say that this is not specific to the Shī‘ah, but it only became the distinctive characteristic of the Shī‘ah due to them repeatedly being victims of oppression.²

So, is what these scholars say fact? Or is Taqiyyah being practiced to defend Taqiyyah, and to conceal their dogma as long as their reality can potentially be divulged and their dogma exposed before the Muslims? Let us delve into the reality of the matter and investigate the veracity of their claims...

Even if we agree with them that Taqiyyah has completely vanished from their circles and that the Shī‘ah no more have any secret to conceal and any belief wherein the need for Taqiyyah exists, and as a result they openly proclaim whatever they believe before the Muslims with clarity and transparency. We will still say that the effects of Taqiyyah have not come to an end, and that their scholars still practice Taqiyyah to some extent regarding some of their traditions. This is the biggest problem and the gravest sickness which cannot be easily picked up by those who are unaware of their classical works.

1 *Al-Shī‘ah fī al-Mizān* p. 52.

2 For more details refer to: Muḥammad Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā’: *Aṣl al-Shī‘ah* p. 150-153; ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Mūsawī: *Ajwibah Mūsā Jār Allah* p. 68-70; ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Rashatī: *Kashf al-Ishtibāh* p. 130; Muḥsin al-Amīn: *al-Shī‘ah bayn al-Ḥaqā’iq wa al-Awhām* p. 185, onwards; al-Qazwīnī: *al-Shī‘ah fī ‘Aqā’idihim wa Aḥkāmihim* p. 346; Hāshim al-Ḥusaynī: *Dirāsāt fī al-Ḥadīth wa al-Muḥaddithīn* p. 326, onwards.

To elaborate, this problem represents itself in the fact that the practice of Taqiyyah has made it virtually impossible for the Shī'ah to benefit from those narrations in their classical works which are in harmony with what the Muslims believe and which oppose their anomalous views and doctrines... This is so because you will not find a single stance of the Shī'ah in which they have parted with the Muslims but that you will find some narrations in their legacy which contradict it. The manner in which a Shī'ī scholar deals with these narrations (which go against his anomalies and agree with what the Muslims believe) is that he asserts that they were said by the Imām by way of Taqiyyah.

Their contemporary scholars have not differed at all with this approach of their early scholars. You will, therefore, find that one of their core principles, as is established in their early works and contemporary works, is taking the view which opposes the commonality, i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah. They apply this principle when they find contradictory narrations in their books by asserting that the narrations which are in agreement with the Ahl al-Sunnah are to be understood in light of Taqiyyah.

Considering the fact that their narrations are contradictory and that on every topic of belief and practice there are narrations which are in harmony with what the Muslims have, we will realise the gravity of the belief of Taqiyyah and its evil consequences in keeping the Muslims disunited. We do not claim that there are contradictions in narrations, rather it is a reality which their scholars concede. To the extent that al-Ṭūsī has acknowledged that there is barely a narration which is not contradicted by another.¹

This is the acknowledgement of al-Ṭūsī who is the author of two of their four canonical works in ḥadīth and two of their four classical works on transmitter biographies.

In all those narrations wherein there is contradiction, al-Ṭūsī could not muster any answer which could save him and his Shī'ah friends save the answer (that all

1 *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* 1/2.

those narrations which are in harmony with the Muslim-majority and against their anomalies) that they were said by way of Taqiyyah. This is clearly observable in many examples in his books *al-Tahdhīb* and *al-Istibṣār*.¹

From the above it is clear that Taqiyyah is deployed in order to refute established narrations, find an opening for extremism; and keep disunity in the Ummah. How can it then be claimed that Taqiyyah no more exists today when the scholars inevitably practice upon it when discarding narrations?²

Furthermore, just as the doctrine of Taqiyyah became an obstacle from the Shī'ah benefitting from those narrations of their legacy which are in conformance with the majority of the Muslims, it likewise prevented the voice of any intelligent and balanced person rising among them from having any impact or benefit.

Probably those who invented this belief wanted that the Shī'ah to always remain such that they find it difficult to reform and realise the truth. This is not just a theoretical statement which is not supported by reality, rather the reality of the Shī'ah attests to this. For example, the greatest blasphemy of the Shī'ah and its most contentious issue is the erroneous belief of omission and interpolation taking place in the Qur'ān; a belief that has permeated their dogma and found its place in their major books. When scholars amongst the Shī'ah, like al-Murtaḍā, Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī, and al-Ṭabarsī disproved it and asserted that the Shī'ī dogma has nothing to do with it, their later scholars like Ni'mat Allāh al-Jazā'irī and al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī interpreted their denial as Taqiyyah.³

1 See: *al-Istibṣār* 1/60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, onwards.

2 Gathering the scattered narrations from their books which oppose their anomalies (and which they interpret with Taqiyyah) is a very beneficial work in this era, and some scholars of India and Pakistan have started this initiative. See for example: 'Abd al-Sattār al-Tonsawī: *Manāqib al-Khulafā' al-Arba'ah fī Mu'allafāt al-Shī'ah*. Probably the first person to start this was Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz in his book *Tuḥfah Ithnay 'Ashariyyah*.

3 See: p. 377 of this book.

Considering the fact that they deploy Taqiyyah all the time in order to suppress the truth and nullify it, can it then be claimed that it has ended in the Shī'ah dogma? Likewise, when their scholar al-Ṭūsī started to write his exegesis and endeavoured therein to evade the esoteric interpretive tendency of the Bāṭiniyyah and inclined towards benefitting from the reports of the *Salaf* (pious predecessors), their scholars interpreted his enterprise as Taqiyyah.¹

As you have noticed, this belief has become a destructive measure which the extremist Shī'ah deploy in order to keep the Shī'ah within the confines of extremism and at variance with the Muslim majority or with Islam itself. Can it still be claimed that the era of Taqiyyah has ended when its poisonous effects have permeated the very core of the dogma and destroyed it from within?

If in this age where Kufr is reigning supreme and the might of the Muslims has dwindled, the Shī'ah aver that there is no need for Taqiyyah, then in which age did the Shī'ah really hold on to the principle of Taqiyyah? They consider the era of the three Khulafā' and the golden age of Islam to be the era of Taqiyyah. This implies that they consider the condition of the Muslims in our times to have improved from what it was during the reign of the rightful Khulafā'. Hence their scholar al-Mufīd asserts that 'Alī عليه السلام lived in the era of the three Khulafā' with Taqiyyah and displaying outward agreement; he draws a parable and says that his condition at that time was like the condition of Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم when he was amidst the polytheists in Makkah before migration.² This implies that he considers the Ṣaḥābah who were alive during the *Khilāfah Rāshidah* (righteous reign) equal to the polytheists by whose side Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم lived in Makkah. Thus the relationship of 'Alī عليه السلام with them was like the relationship of Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم with the polytheists.

The conclusion is thus the following: the time in which the might of the Muslims is dwindling is the time of the glory of the Shī'ah and their freedom, because

1 See: p. 264 - 265 of this book.

2 Refer back to p. 61 - 62.

their religion is different from the religion of the Ṣaḥābah (the generation which received its Dīn directly from Nabī ﷺ, regarding whose time Nabī ﷺ gave testimony of goodness, and the with whom Allah was pleased and who was pleased with Allah) their era according to this cult which has distanced its people from the straight path was the era of Taqiyyah and their generation a generation of disbelief. When these devious cults were gripped by confusion due to the many actions and sayings of Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī رضي الله عنه opposing their views and ideas during his own reign, they found no other solution but to consider the era of his reign an era of Taqiyyah as well. Their scholar Ni'mat Allāh al-Jazā'irī, who is described as 'the authoritative master and the reliable pillar', says the following:

ولما جلس أمير المؤمنين رضي الله عنه لم يتمكن من إظهار ذلك القرآن وإخفاء هذا لما فيه من إظهار الشيعة على من سبقه، كما لم يقدر على النهي عن صلاة الضحى، وكما لم يقدر على إجراء متعة النساء، وكما لم يقدر على عزل شريح عن القضاء ومعاوية عن الإمارة

And when Amīr al-Mu'minīn رضي الله عنه sat¹ he was unable to bring to the fore that Qur'ān² and hide this one due to it entailing the victory of the Shī'ah upon those who preceded them. He likewise did not manage to ban the forenoon prayer, officially instate Mut'ah with women, and dismiss Shurayḥ from presiding over the judiciary, and Mu'āwiyah from leadership.³

This is how they distort those facts which allude the true religion of 'Alī by claiming that they were all based on Taqiyyah. Was there really any need for practicing Taqiyyah at that time, especially when the issue at hand was pertaining to the very basis of this Dīn, the Qur'ān? And was there any need for practicing Taqiyyah during the mighty days of Islam and the Muslims? Again, how can it then be claimed that the era of Taqiyyah has ended when the dogma of the Shī'ah is based upon it and when the scholars of the Shī'ah are steering the ship of Shī'ism to ruination with the flag of Taqiyyah.

1 i.e. he sat upon the throne of Khilāfah.

2 This refers to the Qur'ān which with their awaited absent Imām, as they allege. See p. 346, onwards and p. 1180.

3 Ni'mat Allāh al-Jazā'irī: *al-Anwār al-Nu'māniyyah* 2/362.

Furthermore, the one who ponders over their texts will learn that Taqiyyah is not only a measure deployed at the time of need. Rather it is abused and misused to lie, deceive, make the permissible impermissible and vice versa. So much so that their narrations state that the Imāms would practice it in gatherings where there would be no one to fear and where there would be not the slightest reason for it permissibility, as has passed already.¹

Hence, Taqiyyah still continues to leave its effects upon the Shīʿī dogma; it was deployed in the past not due to any necessity, but intentionally and happily; it was deployed in a purely Shīʿī environment; and owing to it the Qurʾān was explained in unprecedented ways, so much so that the Imām would interpret one verse of the Qurʾān in three different ways in one gathering, each one different from the next, and that is all considered to be due to Taqiyyah,² despite it being impossible to perceive that Taqiyyah was needed when interpreting the Qurʾān during the mighty days of Islam and the Muslims. The conclusion is clear: Taqiyyah was not deployed at the time of need only, nor has its effects ended in the Shīʿī dogma.

This is further emphasised by their contemporary scholar Muḥammad Ṣādiq al-Rūḥānī, also known as *al-Āyah al-ʿUdhmā* (the greatest sign). He categorises Taqiyyah into four types (suggesting that there are other reasons other than necessity to practice Taqiyyah):

التقية الخوفية، والتقية الإكراهية، والتقية الكتمانية، والتقية المداراتية

Taqiyyah due to fear, due to coercion, with the intent of concealing, and with the intent of affability.³

Hence these people who claim that the Shīʿah only practice Taqiyyah at the time of need, their claim is only true regarding Taqiyyah due to fear and Taqiyyah due

1 Refer to the chapter of Taqiyyah in this book: p. 1085, onwards.

2 Refer to p. 1096 of this book.

3 Muḥammad Ṣādiq Rūḥānī: booklet regarding Taqiyyah, found included in the book *al-Amr bi al-Maʿrūf wa al-Nahy ʿan al-Munkar* p. 148-149.

to coercion. But it is not true regarding Taqiyyah with the intent of concealing and Taqiyyah with the intent of affability. This suggests that Taqiyyah is still deployed according to the Shī'ah; for its scope is wider than just necessity and fear. They have used Taqiyyah as a pretext to make lying, deceiving, and fabricating permissible, as will be illustrated ahead.

Having said all of this, in the authoritative books of the Shī'ah there are narrations which emphasise that, unless the Mahdī emerges, under no circumstances will it be permissible to give up Taqiyyah; the one who abandons it during the era of occultation is equal to a discarder of ṣalāh, rather a person who discards it, according to them, has parted with the dogma of the Imāmiyyah.

How can Mughniyah then claim that the era of Taqiyyah has ended? Is he unaware of the reality of his dogma?

Their reliable books document the following narration:

فمن ترك التقية قبل خروج قائمنا فليس منا

He who leaves Taqiyyah before the emergence of our Imām is not from amongst us.¹

Similarly, their senior scholar and Āyat in this age Muḥammad Bāqir al-Ṣadr asserts that their narrations, in their abundance, have reached the extent of being widely transmitted and even the extent of *Tawātur* (such diffuse transmission as cannot be rejected).² He motivates that leaving Taqiyyah before the emergence would:

إلى بقاء وجود العدد الكافي من المخلصين الممحصين، الذين يشكل وجودهم أحد الشرائط الأساسية للظهور

1 Al-Ṭabarsī: *A'lām al-Warā* p. 408; Ibn Bābawayh: *Ikmāl al-Dīn* p. 210; al-Ḥurr al-'Āmilī: *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 11/465-466; *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/217.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ghaybah al-Kubrā* p. 353.

Lead to impeding the realisation of a sufficient amount of sincere and purified individuals whose existence represents one of the conditions for the emergence¹ (of the Mahdī).

Their narrations also equate Taqiyyah to nine tenths of Dīn and they also class a person who does not practice Taqiyyah as one bereft of īmān,² without any exception of any time.

The question is: Is Mughniyah and the other scholars of the Shī'ah unaware of all these realities owing to which they claim that the era of Taqiyyah has ended and that Taqiyyah is not part of their religion? I believe that after reading the aforementioned texts of the Shī'ah you will reach the same conclusion that professor Maḥmūd al-Mal Allāḥ³ reached:

إن قول معنية: انتهى عهد التقية اليوم عند الشيعة إنما هو تقية على تقية

The statement of Mughniyah that the era of Taqiyyah has ended today according to the Shī'ah is merely practicing Taqiyyah upon Taqiyyah.⁴

Likewise in *al-Wāfi*, which is a compilation of the four early canonical works of the Shī'ah, the following texts appears:

يعني لا تظهروا للناس ما نكتمه عنهم ولا تقولوا لهم إن سرنا غير موافق لعلانيتنا، وإنا نكتم عنهم غير ما نظهر لهم، ونظهر غير ما نكتم. فإن ذلك مفوت لمصلحة التقية التي بها بقاؤنا وبقاء أمرنا. بل كونوا على ما نحن عليه قائلين ما نقول، صامتين عما نصمت موافقين لنا غير مخالفين عن أمرنا

i.e. Do not disclose before people what we hide from them. Our secret is not in harmony with our external. For what we hide from them is different

1 Ibid. 253-254.

2 See p. 1089 of this book.

3 A contemporary Iraqi scholar who took up the task of combatting the conspiracies of the Shī'ah in Iraq which they were executing under the pretext of 'Islāmic unity'. He done so by writing in the newspaper al-Sijil and by writing booklets in this regard. One of his books is *al-Waḥdah al-Islāmiyyah bayn al-Akhdh wa al-Radd*.

4 *Majmū' al-Sunnah* 1/111.

from what we reveal to them and what we reveal to them is different from what we hide from them. Doing otherwise is losing the benefit of Taqiyyah upon which is based our existence and the existence of the Shī'ah. Thus remain on what we are, say what we say, remain silent where we remain silent, agree with us and do not oppose us in our matter.¹

It is as though he is saying, in the style of Mughnīyah, 'Don't say to the people that the era of Taqiyyah still remains and that our internal is different from our external; for that will destroy the benefit of Taqiyyah.'

Realistically, should we expect Mughnīyah to say that Taqiyyah is still practiced and we deal with you according to its demands, especially when he is talking to the professors of philosophy in Egypt? What he has stated is in accordance with what his dogma demands, i.e. concealing the matter of Taqiyyah itself.

A person who reads the contemporary books of the Shī'ah, deliberates over them, and compares them (with other material on the same topic) will reach the conclusion that Taqiyyah still continues to be practiced. We have already studied examples of how the Shī'ah reject their fundamental beliefs like that of *Raj'ah*; and how they deny the existence of texts which exist in dozens of their books, as we seen in the case of 'Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Najafī who emphatically denies the existence of any narration or text which suggests that interpolation and omission took place in the Qur'ān.

In fact at times one Shī'ī scholar will contradict himself due to him making statements based on the demands of Taqiyyah as per the situation and the people being addressed. For example, Mughnīyah himself, despite claiming that the era of Taqiyyah has ended, claims that the Shī'ah do not denigrate the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم in his exegesis *al-Kāshif* but then he denigrates senior Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم in his book *Fī Zilāl Nahj al-Balāghah*, as has passed already.² Likewise he claims in his book *Ma' al-*

1 Al-Fayḍ al-Kāshānī: *al-Wāfi*: Kitāb al-Ḥujjah: subchapter regarding *Nawādir*: 2/60.

2 See p. 1473 of this book.

Shī'ah al-Imāmiyyah that Imāmah is not one of the fundamentals of Islam, rather it is a principle of the Shī'ī dogma. And thus the one who denies it but believes in the oneness of Allah, the prophethood of Nabī ﷺ and the afterlife is a Muslim although not a Shī'ī. But in another book *al-Shī'ah wa al-Tashayyu'* he says the following regarding their festival of Ghadīr:

إن احتفالنا بهذا اليوم هو احتفال بالقرآن الكريم، وسنة النبي العظيم بالذات، احتفال بالإسلام ويوم الإسلام... إن النهي عن يوم الغدير تعبير ثان عن النهي بالأخذ بالكتاب والسنة وتعاليم الإسلام ومبادئه.

Celebrating this day is like celebrating the Qur'ān and the Sunnah of the great Nabī. It is celebrating Islam and the day of Islam. Rejecting the day of Ghadīr is in other words preventing people from practicing upon the Qur'ān, the Sunnah, the teachings of Islam and its principles.¹

He then presents as evidence the statement of their contemporary scholar 'Abd Allah al-'Alāyilī which is:

إن عيد الغدير جزء من الإسلام فمن أنكره فقد أنكر الإسلام بالذات

The festival of Ghadīr is part of Islam, whoever rejects it has rejected Islam itself.²

By comparing both his statements the reality becomes clear. In the first statement he claims that the one who rejects Imāmah is a Muslim and in the second statement he asserts that the one who rejects the festival of Ghadīr, which is an innovation for which there is no evidence in the Qur'ān, rejects Islam itself. Is there any other plausible interpretation for this contradiction besides Taqiyyah?

But which of the two statements really represents the Shī'ī dogma? The second statement without any doubt represents what appears in their classical works.

1 *Al-Shī'ah wa al-Tashayyu'* p. 258.

2 Ibid. p. 258. Al-'Alāyilī had made this statement in a sermon which was broadcasted by the Lebanese radio station on the 18 of Dhī al-Ḥijjah 1380 A.H. (see: ibid. p. 258).

And probably what he has said therein is actually the actual stance which came to the fore due to his deep emotions and sentimental link to the innovated festival.

Furthermore, the Shī'ī libraries have published many books in order to propagate Shī'ism amongst the Ahl al-Sunnah. The person who reads them will probably reach the conclusion that the authors are one of two people: either a heretic whose goal is to misguide the servants of Allah with lying and deception, or a Shī'ī who in the name of Taqiyyah considers everything to be permissible. The common phenomenon which permeates all these books is the excessive usage of Taqiyyah. And that is why, despite the element of lying being glaring in them, I have not come across any criticism rising from the Shī'ī circles.

The most glaring example of this is the book *al-Murāja'āt* of 'Abd al-Ḥusayn Sharaf al-Dīn al-Mūsawī. The proselytisers of Shī'ism have lent a lot of credence to this book; they have used it as one of their most effective tools to mislead people, or in other words, to mislead their followers and the Shī'ah. Simply because the Ahl al-Sunnah, more specifically the scholars among them have no knowledge whatsoever of these books which are printed and published by the publishing houses of the Shī'ah.

The importance they accord to this book and their immense infatuation over it have increased to such an extent that it has been published more than a hundred times, as is claimed by some of the Shī'ah.¹

In its misleading nature and deceptive approach this book is probably like Ibn al-Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī's book which was debunked and refuted by Ibn Taymiyah رحمته الله in his *Minhāj al-Sunnah*. Hopefully Allah سبحانه وتعالى will provide the means to expose the book in question in a similar manner by way of a dedicated study, but hereunder I allude to some aspects thereof:

The book is basically about the correspondence which took place between the leading scholar of al-Azhar, Shaykh Salīm al-Bishrī who, as this Rāfiḍī alleges,

1 Mughniyah: *al-Khumainī Aqwāluḥū wa af'āluḥū* p. 45.

represents the Ahl al-Sunnah and defends their dogma, and ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn who represents the Shī‘ah and defends their dogma. The correspondence ends with the acknowledgment of the Shaykh of al-Azhar that the Sunnī dogma is wrong and the Shī‘ī dogma is valid and correct. It is without any doubt a cunning ploy of the Shī‘ah and a contrived correspondence aimed at propagating the Shī‘ism.

For a person who knows the dogma of the Shī‘ah and has recourse to their books, this style is no surprise. There is nothing new in it, it is an old approach which the Shī‘ah have always used; an approach wherein they wrote books containing the demerits of the Ṣaḥābah and the invalidity of the Sunnī creed, amongst other things, and attributed them to prominent scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Hence al-Shawkānī, in his book, *al-Fawā'id al-Majmū'ah* has established a chapter with the title *al-Nusakh al-Mawḍū'ah* (fabricated books). After enlisting them he concludes that most of them have been contrived by the Shī‘ah clergy and that their followers still possess them.¹

Similarly, the author of *al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnay ‘Ashariyyah* has also alluded to this approach, and as an example has referred to the book *Sirr al-‘Ālamīn* (a book which they falsely attributed to Imām Muḥammad al-Ghazālī and filled with erroneous ideas). In the introduction of the book they allege that he bequeathed that it be kept a secret and it be preserved. They also allege that he said that whatever is in this book is his belief and whatever is elsewhere is due to flattery and compromise.²

I have seen that in some of their contemporary works they draw evidence from this fabricated book against the Ahl al-Sunnah.³

1 *Al-Fawā'id al-Majmū'ah* p. 425.

2 *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnay ‘Ashariyyah* p. 33; also see: al-Suwaydī: *Naqd ‘Aqā'id al-Shī‘ah* p. 25.

3 See for example, the references cited in the book *Kashf al-Istihbāh* of ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn al-Rashatī which was published in Tehran in 1368 A.H. by al-Maṭba‘ah al-‘Askariyyah.

This book has likewise been published several times.¹

Regarding this particular book, professor ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Badawī has mentioned that three orientalis, viz. Goldzhier, Bouygues, and Macdonald, considered it a fabrication against al-Ghazālī.² He concurs with them and also concludes that the book is a complete fabrication and in substantiation thereof he says that on p. 82 of the book al-Ghazālī allegedly says:

أنشدني المعري لنفسه وأنا شاب في صحبته يوسف بن علي شيخ الإسلام

Al-Ma‘arrī himself rendered his poetry before me when I was still a youngster in the company of Shaykh al-Islām Yūsuf ibn ‘Alī.

Whereas al-Ma‘arrī passed away in 448 A.H. and al-Ghazālī was born in 450 A.H. Hence it was impossible for al-Ma‘arrī to have rendered his poetry before al-Ghazālī.³

The purpose for opening this chapter of the past is to allude to the fact that the book *al-Murāja‘āt* is just another book in the same tradition; it is a link in the insidious conspiracies which have their roots deep in history, carried out by the Shī‘ah in order not to lose their followers and to create discord in the Ummah and spread Shī‘ism amongst the Muslims.

Nonetheless, I return to *al-Murāja‘āt* to briefly point out some of the signs which suggest that the book is a fabrication.

1 It was first printed in Mumbai in 1314 A.H., then in Cairo in 1324 A.H. and 1327 A.H. It was likewise published in Tehran (no mention of date). See ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Badawī: *Mu‘allafāt al-Ghazālī* p. 225.

2 *Mu‘allafāt al-Ghazālī* p. 271.

3 Ibid. p. 271. Surprisingly I found that al-Dhahabī attributes the book to him *Mizān al-ʿitidāl* 1/500. Probably he was unaware of the reality, or that a book with this title was written by al-Ghazālī but was later lost and the Shī‘ah thus took advantage of the name and compiled a book holding the same title and attributed to al-Ghazālī.

Firstly, one of the strongest indications that the book is a fabrication is that the style of the letters which are documented therein, which represent the views of two scholars who are different in their ideology, knowledge, social setup; is one and the same. There is no difference whatsoever in them. This clearly shows that the fabricator of these letters is one person and that is ‘Abd al-Ḥusayn.

Secondly, the leading scholar of al-Azhar had acquired such a prominent position due to his knowledge and eruditeness and not due to just obtaining a job. But in this book he is portrayed as a junior or an amateur student whose duty is to acknowledge everything that was said by this Rāfiḍī and at times even praise him for every line that he wrote. Notwithstanding that at times his answers consisted of such esoteric interpretations of Qur’ānic verses which have no link with them whatsoever and the deviance whereof can be picked up by beginners in the path of knowledge amidst the Ahl al-Sunnah, nay even by their laity.¹ And even though at times they contained authentication of forged narrations and emphasis upon one of their blasphemous beliefs. This Rāfiḍī has documented that the Shaykh of al-Azhar conceded the authenticity and diffuse transmission of many narrations which are weak according to the scholars of ḥadīth and some even complete fabrications. Their weak or forged status is not unknown even to beginners, let alone the Shaykh of al-Azhar who was the incumbent of a position which was only obtainable by someone who had saturated himself with knowledge and was well-versed in all the Islamic sciences.² Not only that, but this Rāfiḍī has depicted the Shaykh of al-Azhar as so inadequate in his knowledge as to not even know the references for narrations in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, not the books of the Shī‘ah, owing to which he would ask this Rāfiḍī to point them out to him.³

Could the Shaykh of al-Azhar really be so ignorant? Could he be so incapable in maintaining a polemical discussion despite having access to libraries? Would he

1 See for example p. 62-73 in his book *al-Murāja‘āt*.

2 See for example p. 55-60 of *al-Murāja‘āt*; also see *al-Bayyināt fī al-Radd ‘alā Abāṭil al-Murāja‘āt* p. 45, onwards.

3 See *al-Murāja‘āt* p. 237.

really give this Shī'ah scholar the trouble to help him when he could easily seek the assistance of the scholars of al-Azhar and its students? And since when did this Rāfiḍī become a reliable transmitter of ḥadīth according to the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah?

Thirdly, his book emerged without any authorisation; there is nothing in his book which suggests that those alleged letters are credible; not even a picture of some of them despite them amounting to a hundred and twelve letters in total, fifty six being written by the Shaykh of al-Azhar.

All these alleged letters were written by hand, so why did he not produce one letter at least which would prove his claims, especially when in them was contained a very pivotal issue like that of the Shaykh of al-Azhar giving up the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah and taking up the creed of the Shī'ah and converting from the truth to falsehood. His inability to prove any evidence in this regard reveals that his book is a forgery and that the letters attributed to Shaykh Salīm are lies. It actually extirpates the discussion from its very roots.

All these claims are only from one side, from this Rāfiḍī alone; Shaykh Salīm is not known to have said anything that alludes to this correspondence. Likewise there is not a shred of evidence to be found during his lifetime that proves the validity of the claims of this Rāfiḍī. And thus he only dared to publish the book twenty years after the demise of Shaykh Salīm al-Bishrī.¹

Due to his inability to substantiate his claims with any evidence, and due to him forging letters which supposedly mimicked the style of al-Bishrī and not being able to produce a picture of the letters in his original writing, he was compelled to expose himself in the introduction by saying:

وأنا لا أدعي أن هذه الصحف تقتصر على النصوص التي تألفت يومئذ بيننا، ولا أن شيئاً من ألفاظ هذه
المراجعات خطه غير قلبي

¹ He passed away in 1335 A.H. (see *al-A'lām* 3/180).

I do not claim that these pages strictly contain the texts which were exchanged between us, nor that some of the contents of these letters were written by a pen other than mine.¹

If these letters were not written by anyone else's pen then why is he accusing the Shaykh of al-Azhar of writing this evil?

He has further exposed himself with the following sentence:

إنه زاد في هذه الرسائل ما يقتضيه المقام والنصح والإرشاد

He has added in these letters things which the situation demands and also advice and directives.²

This is another confession that he has attributed to the Shaykh of al-Azhar things which he has not said; and he deems his lies against him to be fine under the pretext of advice according to the need of the situation; exactly the reason for which Taqiyyah is practiced.

As long as it remains a well-known fact that the Shī'ah lie against Allah, His Rasūl ﷺ and the Ahl al-Bayt it should not come across as a surprise if they lie against others besides them.

This book represents one form of Taqiyyah in our times.

There are many other examples. And the lies which are spoken in the name of Taqiyyah are of various types which require a dedicated study.³

1 See the introduction of *al-Murāja'āt* p. 27.

2 Ibid.

3 Another example is the book *Limādhā Ikhtartu Madhhab al-Shī'ah* (Why I Chose the Creed of the Shī'ah). This book contains a fabricated story which alleges that one of the senior scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah Muḥammad Mar'ī al-Anṭākī gave up the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah and embraced the creed of the Shī'ah after ascertaining that the former is false and the latter is true. It is filled with forgeries, lies and accusations, as is the wont of the Shī'ah when practicing Taqiyyah. continued...

This style of forgery has its dangers. The Shī'ah have frequently deployed it in their works and it has become one of the offshoots of Taqiyyah. Al-Suwaydī thus mentions that many books were attributed to the Ahl al-Sunnah in this manner, and only people who are acquainted with the style of the dialogue of the Ahl al-Sunnah will detect their falsity.¹

Lastly, Allah ﷻ at times reveals the truth upon the tongue of the Shī'ah. Hence one of their contemporary scholars has revealed the reality by conceding that the book of Sulaym ibn Qays and other books are forgeries (i.e. falsely attributed to their alleged authors), but for noble purposes.² As though suggesting that such fabrication is permissible as long as the purpose behind it is valid and 'noble'.

We are not going to delve further into this topic, due to limitations,³ and because this chapter is dedicated to the contemporary Shī'ah.

Continued from page 1503

Can a person who is saturated with knowledge of Sharī'ah ever believe in their erroneous belief of the Mahdī whose emergence the Shī'ah are anticipating for more than eleven centuries; and can he ever believe in the fable of Raj'ah which according to the Shī'ah entails that revenge will be taken from the beloveds of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, his relatives in law, and some of his wives, the Mothers of the Believers; or will he ever believe in the blasphemy of Badā'?

No scholar will ever be beguiled into following such a creed. It is thus narrated from some of the Salaf that they feared the non-Arabs and the amateur would be ensnared in innovations. As for the one who possess deep knowledge of Sharī'ah, he will never fall prey to the lies of the Shī'ah (see the introduction of this book p. 6). Some scholars are thus reported to have said that the scholars of the Shī'ah are one of two people: an ignoramus or a heretic (see: *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/77).

This Shī'ah who is known as al-Anṭākī claims that he resides in Aleppo and presides over the position of the supreme judge in the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah, whereas none of the scholars of Aleppo have any acquaintance with him, as was told to me by a number of scholars, one among them being Shaykh 'Abd al-Fattāḥ Abū Ghuddah.

1 Al-Suwaydī: *Naqd 'Aqā'id al-Shī'ah* (manuscript) p. 25.

2 Al-Sha'rānī: *Ta'īqāt 'Ilmiyyah* ('alā al-Kāfī ma' Sharḥ al-Māzindarānī) 2/373-374.

3 This topic specifically requires an in-depth study, due to it being crucial on the one hand and revealing the true face of Shī'ism on the other hand.

The Scholars of the Shī'ah practice Taqiyyah even with their Followers:

Although the Shī'ah, as represented by some of their scholars, claim that Taqiyyah no more exists, but they still continue to practice Taqiyyah, not with the Ahl al-Sunnah, but with their own followers. For surely amongst the contemporary scholars there are some who practice Taqiyyah with their followers, i.e. they express that which they do not believe.

This is not merely a claim, but a reality which is backed by their confessions. Three of their senior scholars hesitated in announcing a flaw in a secondary issue of *Fiqh* due to the fear of their followers. They would thus secretly give fatwas against it and would assert the contrary in front of their close associates.¹

What is interesting in this regard is that Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah was the one who discovered this, notwithstanding that he is from amongst those who claim that Taqiyyah has come to an end. He says:

أحدث القول بنجاسة أهل الكتاب مشكلة اجتماعية للشيعة، وأوقعهم في ضيق وشدة وبخاصة إذا سافروا إلى بلد مسيحي كالمغرب، أو كان فيه مسيحيون كלבنا... وقد عاصرت ثلاثة مراجع كبار من أهل الفتيا والتقليد: الأول: كان في النجف الأشرف وهو الشيخ محمد رضا آل ياسين، والثاني في قم وهو السيد صدر الدين الصدر، والثالث، في لبنان وهو السيد محسن الأمين، وقد أفتوا جميعا بالطهارة، وأسروا بذلك إلى من يتقون به، ولم يعلنوا خوفا من المهوشين، على أن ياسين كان أجراً للجميع وأنا على يقين بأن كثيراً من فقهاء اليوم والأمس يقولون بالطهارة، ولكنهم يخشون أهل الجهل والله أحق أن يخشوه

The view that the people of the book are impure has created a social problem for the Shī'ah and has placed them in difficulty and under constraints, especially when they travel to a Christian country like Spain, or to a place where Christians are found like Lebanon. I accompanied three scholars who hold prominent positions in issuing fatwas and whose views are followed: the first is from the noble Najf, Shaykh Muḥammad

1 Despite them boasting that the door of Ijtihād is still open in the Shī'ī dogma. If this is their condition in a secondary issue then how can it be hoped from them that they will revisit their primary issues wherein they have parted with the majority of the Muslims?

Riḍā Āl Yāsīn, the second is: al-Sayyid Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Ṣadr from Qum, and the third is al-Sayyid Muḥsin al-Amīn from Lebanon. They all issued the fatwa of purity and they covertly conveyed it to those who they trusted; but they did not openly proclaim it due to fearing the instigators. Yāsīn was nonetheless the bravest of them. And I am fairly convinced that many of the jurists of the present and the past held the view of purity, but they feared the ignorant people whereas Allah is more deserving of being feared.¹

Mughniyah also mentions in his exegesis *al-Kāshif* that their supreme scholar al-Khūṭ likewise secretly imparted his view to those who trusted him.²

Likewise, Kāẓim al-Kifāṭ also acknowledges that their leader al-Ghiṭā' issued the fatwā of purity and informed only his associates of it because he feared that the minds of the laity will not be able to withstand it.³

Commenting upon this professor 'Alī al-Sālūs says, "This is how knowledge is forsaken and lies are attributed to Islam, i.e. when people are entrusted with knowledge but they waste it and distort it due to fearing the people and not fearing Allah."⁴

Adding to that, I would say that one of the many reasons for which the Shī'ah scholars consider (and as a result practice Taqiyyah with) their ignorant followers is that these people are the source of their sustenance which they unrightfully receive from them in the name of *Khums*.

If this is the stance of five of their leading scholars in the present age regarding a secondary issue which they know for sure is wrong, how can it then be expected from them to entertain even the prospect of revisiting their primary issues.

1 Mughniyah; *Fiqh al-Imām Ja'far al-Sādiq* p. 31-33.

2 Mughniyah; *al-Kāshif* 6/18.

3 This is documented by professor 'Alī al-Sālūs (see: *Fiqh al-Imāmiyyah* p. 81).

4 'Alī al-Sālūs; *Fiqh al-Imāmiyyah* p. 81 (footnote).

From all of this it is clear that the Shī'ah will never give up Taqiyyah and they will continue practicing it till the emergence of their Mahdī, as is emphasised in their narrations and endorsed by their actions, even though their use thereof decreases and increases as per the conditions and demands, i.e. their practice of Taqiyyah considerably decreases whenever they assume authority and rule a dynasty. This becomes evidently clear when comparing the writings of the scholars of the Safawid Dynasty (like the views of al-Majlisī in *Bihār al-Anwār*, Ni'mat Allāh al-Jazā'irī in *al-Anwār al-Nu'māniyyah*, al-Baḥrānī in *Tafsīr al-Burhān*, amongst others) with those of their predecessors who were writing under an established Islamic Khilāfah; for you will find at the end of each of the latter's texts the directive to keep it concealed and hidden,¹ to the extent that even the issue of Imāmah was secretly circulated in the initial stages.²

In conclusion, these are but a few views of their contemporary scholars and their beliefs which outline their theological boundaries which they abide by in the present age. I did not delve into beliefs wherein nothing new has developed or no new claims have been made, because as long as the contemporaries and the ancients remain linked in deriving doctrine from the same classical books there is no hope of any change taking place for the better.

From the various discussions above, it is clear that the contemporaries have surpassed their predecessors, because they inherited the end-result of lies and fabrications which have incessantly continued throughout the ages and considered that to be their reliable sources. They facilitated publishing houses to spread these books. The weakness of the Muslims was one of the causes of their enthusiasm and the widespread ignorance of the Ahl al-Sunnah and their weakness were part of the reasons for people being impacted by them and being ensnared in their deviance.

1 See for example the narrations regarding the doctrine of Ṭīnah on p. 1280 of this book.

2 See p. 894 of this book.

The Fourth Chapter

The State of the Scholars

After having analysed the relationship between the contemporaries and the ancients and discovering that there still exists a strong link between them, and after learning that in many aspects what was considered to be extreme by the ancients has been integrated into the Shī'ī dogma by the contemporaries, does there remain a need to study their dynasty? Is not the matter as clear as daylight to anyone who can see? There are two primary reasons for studying their current dynasty and they are:

Firstly: according to its prime leader and its constitution, this dynasty has espoused a new idea in the realm of Twelver Shiasm which has provoked much controversy amongst the Shī'ah scholars, causing their reactions to vary from approval to disapproval. This idea is all about according the Shī'ī jurist-consult the duties, capabilities, and prerogatives of the Mahdī, as will be discussed in depth in the coming pages; Khomeini presided over all the alleged duties of their awaited Mahdī after the emergence of their state.

Secondly, it has been claimed that this state represents Islam in this era, that its scholars are the reference scholars of the Muslims and that its founder is a revivalist. This gained acceptance amidst some Muslims, and after the emergence of the Shī'ī state it was claimed that the Shī'ī dogma has reverted to its pristine beginnings of associating with Allah and his Rasūl and loving the Ahl al-Bayt sincerely in a manner that does not make its adherent lose respect for other Muslims, especially the Companions of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ.¹

Furthermore, some newspapers even went on to aver that the results brought about by the movement of Khomeini was due to it being a fully Islamic movement.²

1 *Al-Balāgh* magazine: edition no. 512 (published on the 9th of Dhī Qa'dah 1399 A.H.)

2 *Al-I'tisām*: the fifth edition (published in Rabī' al-Awwal 1399 A.H.)

Likewise the *al-Maʿrifat al-Tūnisiyyah* magazine considered Khomeini a candidate for receiving the grand prize of king Faisal for serving Islam.¹

Likewise, many other magazines like *al-Rāʿid*,² *al-Daʿwah*,³ *al-Risālah*,⁴ *al-Amān*,⁵ etc. adopted a similar stance, all them being the magazines of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Some affiliates of the Ahl al-Sunnah wrote books regarding Khomeini and his revolution wherein they extolled his merits and considered his rule to be a true reflection of the Islamic values.⁶

Similarly, some Islamic movements also issued statements wherein they praised the methodology of Khomeini. To the extent that in the international organization of the Ikhwān al-Muslimīn Khomeini's rule was described as the only Islamic government in the world.⁷

Nonetheless, it was a very beguiling and deceptive fitnah whose effects still remain up to the present day. And even though some have realised the truth of the matter, others still consider the voices raised against Khomeini to be baseless.⁸

The Shīʿah have obviously exploited this climate to propagate their dogma and proselytise it. This media based propagation which took place through the Islamic newspapers and magazines played a part in obscuring the reality upon the Muslim youth; because all that they knew about the conflict between the Ahl

1 *Al-Maʿrifat al-Tūnisiyyah*: edition no. 9 (published in Dhī al-Ḥijjah 1399 A.H.)

2 *Al-Rāʿid al-ʿAlmāniyyah*: edition no. 34: p. 25-26 (published in Dhī al-Ḥijjah 1398 A.H.)

3 *Al-Daʿwah al-Miṣriyyah*: edition no. 30: p. 6 (published 1/12/1398)

4 *Al-Risālah al-Lubnāniyyah*: edition no. 29 (published in Jumādā al-Thāniyah 1399 A.H.)

5 *Al-Amān al-Lubnāniyyah*: edition no. 31 (published in Shawwāl 1399 A.H.)

6 Like the book: *al-Khumainī al-Ḥall al-Islāmī wa al-Badīl of Faṭḥī ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz* which was published by Dar al-Mukhtār al-Islāmī; *Maʿ Thawrah Irān* (the third study published by the Islamic centre in Aachen; and *Naḥw Thawrah Islāmiyyah* of Muḥammad ʿAnbar.

7 *Al-Shīʿah wa al-Sunnah Ḍajjah Muftā ilah* (part of the publications of Dār al-Mukhtār al-Islāmī) p. 52.

8 Ibid.

al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah is that it is a conflict regarding who was more rightful of leadership and the succession of Rasūl Allah ﷺ: 'Alī or Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, and they assume that that is a generation that has passed and that this difference is of no relevance today.

The Shī'ah, therefore, found fertile grounds for the spreading of Shī'ism, and it is obligatory to divulge the reality and make the people aware of it. Just as it is compulsory to examine every claim of revivalism and every narrative of transformation and change. Probably the ideal way to reach an academic conclusion on the issue would be by studying the ideology of the founding father of this new state and its constitution.¹

The Ideology of its Founder

After referring to the writings of Khomeini in his books: *Kashf al-Asrār*,² *Tahrīr al-Wasīlah*, *al-Hukūmah al-Islāmiyyah*, *Miṣbāḥ al-Imāmah wa al-Wilāyah*, *Rasā'il al-Ta'ādul wa al-Tarjīḥ wa al-Taḥiyyah*, *Durūs fī al-Jihād wa al-Rafḍ*, *Sirr al-Ṣalāh*, etc. it is evident that he had a number of eerie ideologies, the most crucial among them being the following:

1. Polytheistic leanings
2. Extremist Ṣūfī leanings
3. The claim of prophethood
4. Extremism in Rafḍ
5. Complete representation of the hidden Mahdī

1 I have already written regarding Khomeini and the idea of unity between the Ahl al-Sunnah in my research paper which I submitted for my master's degree. In this book however I shall shed light upon new angles which have probably not been touched in all the literature written regarding Khomeini.

2 This book is originally written in Persian. It was translated into Arabic by one of the Persian speaking scholars. And one of the teachers of the Islamic university sent me pictures of this translation. May Allah reward him with goodness.

Firstly: Polytheistic leanings¹

In his book *Kashf al-Asrār* he comes across as a defender of polytheism. He says:

ويمكن أن يقال أن التوسل إلى الموتى وطلب الحاجة منهم شرك، لأن النبي والإمام ليس إلا جمادين فلا يتوقع منهما النفع والضرر. والجواب: إن الشرك هو طلب الحاجة من غير الله مع الاعتقاد بأن هذا الغير هو إله ورب، وأما إذا طلب الحاجة من الغير من غير هذا الاعتقاد فذلك ليس بشرك، ولا فرق في هذا المعنى بين الحي والميت، ولهذا لو طلب حاجته من الحجر والمدر لا يكون شركاً، مع أنه قد فعل فعلاً باطلاً. ومن ناحية أخرى نحن نستمد من أرواح الأنبياء والمقدسة والأئمة الذين أعطاهم الله قدرة. لقد ثبت بالبراهين القطعية والأدلة العقلية المحكمة حياة الروح بعد الموت والإحاطة الكاملة للأرواح على هذا العالم.

The objection can possibly be raised that considering the dead to be agents and seeking needs from them is Shirk because the Nabī and the Imām are lifeless and thus no benefit or harm can be expected from them. The answer is: Shirk entails seeking needs from anyone besides Allah coupled with the belief that he is a deity and a sustainer. But if one seeks a need from him without considering him to be a deity then that is not shirk; in this the living and dead both are equal. Thus seeking ones need from a stone or a piece of clay will not be shirk even though the action is wrong. Seeing it from another perspective, we seek help from the pure souls of the Ambiyā' and the Imāms who are bestowed by Allah with abilities. It is established through categorical evidence and logical proofs that the souls lives after death and that they fully encompass the universe.²

He then goes on to cite the views of the philosophers in order to prove his claims.

The aforementioned text entails the following:

Firstly, His belief that supplicating to stones, idols and shrines is not shirk unless the supplicator considers them to be deities and lords; this is baseless and false,

1 Despite its gravity, I have not come across anyone who has shed light upon this ideology of Khomeini.

2 *Kashf al-Asrār* p. 30.

and to refute this kind of shirk the prophets were sent and the Books revealed. This is the shirk of the polytheists of Makkah which Nabī ﷺ opposed and tried to eradicate. For it is clear that the polytheists would not consider their idols to be lords, rather they would say the following as described by Allah ﷻ in the Qur’ān:

مَا نَعْبُدُهُمْ إِلَّا لِيُقَرِّبُونَا إِلَى اللَّهِ زُلْفَىٰ

We only worship them that they may bring us nearer to God in position.¹

وَيَعْبُدُونَ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ مَا لَا يَضُرُّهُمْ وَلَا يَنْفَعُهُمْ وَيَقُولُونَ هَؤُلَاءِ شَفَعَاؤُنَا عِنْدَ اللَّهِ قُلْ أَتَنْبِئُونَ اللَّهَ بِمَا لَا يَعْلَمُ فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَلَا فِي الْأَرْضِ سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ عَمَّا يُشْرِكُونَ

And they worship other than God that which neither harms them nor benefits them, and they say, “These are our intercessors with God.” Say, “Do you inform God of something He does not know in the heavens or on the earth?” Exalted is He and high above what they associate with Him.²

قُلْ لِمَنِ الْأَرْضُ وَمَنْ فِيهَا إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ. سَيَقُولُونَ لِلَّهِ قُلْ أَفَلَا تَذَكَّرُونَ. قُلْ مَنْ رَبُّ السَّمَاوَاتِ السَّبْعِ وَرَبُّ الْعَرْشِ الْعَظِيمِ. سَيَقُولُونَ لِلَّهِ قُلْ أَفَلَا تَتَّقُونَ. قُلْ مَنْ يَدِّ مَلَكُوتِ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ وَهُوَ يُجِيرُ وَلَا يُجَارُ عَلَيْهِ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ. سَيَقُولُونَ لِلَّهِ قُلْ فَأَنَّى تُسْحَرُونَ

Say, [O Muḥammad], “To whom belongs the earth and whoever is in it, if you should know?” They will say, “To God.” Say, “Then will you not remember?” Say, “Who is Lord of the seven heavens and Lord of the Great Throne?” They will say, “[They belong] to God.” Say, “Then will you not fear Him?” Say, “In whose hand is the realm of all things – and He protects while none can protect against Him – if you should know?” They will say, “[All belongs] to God.” Say, “Then how are you deluded?”³

1 Sūrah al-Zumar: 2.

2 Sūrah Yūnus: 18.

3 Sūrah al-Mu'minūn: 84-89.

These verses establish that the polytheist amongst the Arabs conceded the Oneness of Allah and that He is the creator of everything, but despite that they were still considered polytheists. The shirk that Khomeini is espousing is no different from their shirk.

Secondly, his belief that the dead Imāms have the ability to benefit and harm and his acknowledgement that they seek help from them. This is without doubt the greatest form of shirk; because the dead cannot benefit or harm themselves. Is there any difference between this and the shirk of the polytheists of Quraysh and the polytheists of the various nations which passed before them.¹ The only difference is that these people accord their shirk the name of Islam and consider it as part of the Dīn of Muḥammad ﷺ, as you will see in the defences written for Khomeini.

Lastly, his claim that the souls encompass the entire universe completely and his seeking of evidence from the views of the philosophers. Encompassing the world is for Allah alone. He says:

وَكَانَ اللَّهُ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ مُّحِيطًا

And ever is God, of all things, encompassing.²

The souls are created and controlled. After they leave the bodies they are either in bliss or punishment, and thus have no share in encompassing the universe. However when an idea originates from its locus it is not considered strange. A person who combines between the heresies of the philosophers and the extremism of the Shī'ah can only emerge with a view of this sort or even worst.

1 See: *Sharḥ al-Taḥāwīyyah* p. 20.

2 Sūrah al-Nisā': 126.

His Belief in the Impact of Stars and Days upon the Movements of Men

The ideology of Khomeini has always remained tainted by the assumptions of Shirk and the Mushriks. He claims that in every month there are some wretched days wherein a Shī'ī should not do anything, and that in the transitioning of the moon to various stages there are negative effects on the actions of men. As such a Shī'ī should refrain from doing anything till the moon passes those phases.

There is no doubt that a person who believes that the days and the stars have an impact in a person's fortune, in bringing about harm or preventing it is a polytheist; for this is the belief of the of the *ṣābi'ah* regarding the stars.

The evidence for this belief of Khomeini is the following text which appears in *Tahṛīr al-Wasīlah*:

ويكره إيقاعه (يعني عقد الزواج) والقمر في برج العقرب، وفي محاق الشهر، وفي أحد الأيام المنحوسة في كل شهر: وهي سبعة: يوم ٣، ويوم ٥، ويوم ١٣، ويوم ١٦، ويوم ٢١، ويوم ٢٤، ويوم ٢٥ (وذلك من كل شهر).

It is disliked to contract a contract of marriage when the moon is in the Scorpio, the end of its month and in one of the wretched days; which are seven: the third day, the fifth day, the thirteenth day, the sixteenth day, the twenty first day, the twenty fourth day and the twenty fifth day (these days are found in every month).¹

This is the belief of Khomeini and his followers. Thus what the author of *Tuhfah al-Ithnay 'Ashariyyah* has said regarding them is true:

إن الصابئة كانوا يحترزون عن أيام يكون القمر بها في العقرب، أو الطرف أو المحاق، وكذلك الرافضة... وكانت الصابئة يعتقدون أن جميع الكواكب فاعلة مختارة، وأنها هي المديرية للعالم السفلي، وكذلك الرافضة.

¹ *Tahṛīr al-Wasīlah* 2/238.

The *Ṣābi'ah* would refrain from those days wherein the moon would be in the Scorpio, the beginning of the month or its end. Likewise is the belief of the *Rāfiḍah*. The *Ṣābi'ah* would also believe that the stars do, that they have freewill, and that they administer the world at the bottom. And so is the belief of the *Rāfiḍah*.¹

The Reality of Shirk according to Khomeini

If the idol worship of the polytheist is not shirk according to him, then what constitutes Shirk according to him?

He says:

توجد نصوص كثيرة تصف كل نظام غير إسلامي بأنه شرك، والحاكم أو السلطة فيه طاغوت، ونحن مسؤولون عن إزالة آثار الشرك من مجتمعنا المسلم، ونبعتها تماما عن حياتنا.

There are texts which describe every non-Islamic government whose ruler or governing party is oppressive as Shirk. It is our responsibility to eliminate the effects of Shirk from our Muslim society and distance it completely from our lives.²

As you can see, his understanding of Shirk is that a person of the Ahl al-Sunnah rules over lands of the Muslims; such a person is a polytheist and so are his people. Hence the religion of these people is based on *Wilāyah* and not upon the Oneness of Allah. And thus we find that Shirk is so rampant in their lands.

Secondly Extremism in Taṣawwuf

His extremist leanings in this regard are as clear as can be in his books *Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāyah ilā al-Khilāfah wa al-Wilāyah* and *Sirr al-Ṣalāh*. Hereunder we will shed light on some of his extremist views:

1 *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* p. 299; also refer to *Fatḥ al-Majīd*: chapter regarding astrology p. 365.

2 *Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 33-34; also refer to the discussion on their belief regarding the oneness of Allah in terms of him being the deity on p. 571 of this book.

1. Special incarnation

He says the following regarding Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī:

خليفته (يعني خليفة الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم) القائم في مقامه في الملك والملكوت، المتحد بحقيقته في حضرة الجبروت واللاهوت، أصل شجرة طوبى، وحقيقة سدرة المنتهى، الرفيق الأعلى في مقام أو أدنى، معلم الروحانيين، ومؤيد الأنبياء والمرسلين على أمير المؤمنين

His Khalīfah (the Khalīfah of Rasūl Allah) who is his vicegerent in the kingdom of the seen and the unseen, who is one with him in his essence in grandeur and divinity, the roots of the *Ṭūbā* tree, the essence of the *Sidrah al-Muntahā* (the farthest lote tree), the highest companion at the position of *Aw Adnā* (referring to the journey of Mī'rāj), the teacher of the ascetics and the supporter of the Ambiyā' and the prophets: 'Alī Amīr al-Mu'minīn.¹

Consider his statement 'who is one with him.....and divinity', you will find that it is just like the belief of the Christians regarding the god and the human being one and the same. The extremist Shī'ah had in the past also claimed that Allah سبحانه وتعالى transcended into 'Alī.² And sadly these extremist ideas still linger in the minds of these scholars.

Due to the claim that Allah سبحانه وتعالى descended into 'Alī, as he beliefs, Khomeini attributes the following to Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī:

كنت مع الأنبياء باطنا ومع رسول الله ظاهرا

I was internally with the Ambiyā' and externally with Rasūl Allah.³

Commenting upon this alleged narration he further says:

1 *Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāyah* p. 1.

2 For further details regarding the belief of incarnation according to the extremist sects of the Shī'ah see: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/ 83-86; al-Shahrastānī has averred that all the extremist Shī'ah unanimously agree upon the belief of incarnation (*al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* 1/175).

3 *Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāyah* p. 142.

فإنه عليه السلام صاحب الولاية المطلقة الكلية والولاية باطن الخلافة... فهو عليه السلام بمقام ولايته الكلية قائم على كل نفس بما كسبت، ومع كل الأشياء معية قيومية ظليلة إلهية ظل المعية القيومية الحق الإلهية. إلا أن الولاية كانت في الأنبياء أكثر خصهم بالذكر

Hence he ('Alī) is the possessor of complete and unrestricted *Wilāyah* (authority as a result of succession). And *Wilāyah* is the internal component of *Khilāfah*... He, due to his complete *Wilāyah* is a guardian of every soul in what it has earned. And with everything there is a presence of a guardianship which is reflective of the ultimate divine guardianship. However because (his) *Wilāyah* was more in the prophets he made specific mention of them.¹

As you can see, Khomeini comments upon this narration which is already extreme in its purport, and which is falsely attributed to Amīr al-Mu'minīn, with such words that are more steeped in extremism; for according to him he is not merely the guardian of the *Ambiyā'* but of every living soul. In substantiating this he chooses the purport of a verse which is exclusive to Allah ﷻ and attributes it to the creation. Allah ﷻ says:

أَفَمَنْ هُوَ قَائِمٌ عَلَى كُلِّ نَفْسٍ بِمَا كَسَبَتْ

Then is He who is a maintainer of every soul.²

I.e. Allah ﷻ is the guardian, the possessor of knowledge and the monitor of every living soul. Allah ﷻ says:

وَمَا تَكُونُ فِي شَأْنٍ وَمَا تَتْلُو مِنْهُ مِنْ قُرْآنٍ وَلَا تَعْمَلُونَ مِنْ عَمَلٍ إِلَّا كُنَّا عَلَيْكُمْ شُهُودًا إِذْ تُفِيضُونَ فِيهِ

And, [O Muhammad], you are not [engaged] in any matter or recite any of the Qur'ān and you [people] do not do any deed except that we are witness over you when you are involved in it.^{3,4}

1 *Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāyah* p. 142.

2 *Sūrah al-Ra'd*: 33.

3 *Sūrah Yūnus*: 61.

4 *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 2/556.

Likewise Khomeini says the following regarding the verses:

يُدَبِّرُ الْأَمْرَ يُفَصِّلُ الْآيَاتِ لَعَلَّكُمْ بِلِقَاءِ رَبِّكُمْ تُوقِنُونَ

He arranges [each] matter; He details the signs that you may, of the meeting with your Lord, be certain.¹

أي ربكم الذي هو الإمام

i.e. your lord who is the Imām.²

2. Complete Incarnation

Khomeini surpassed the idea of partial incarnation, specific to ‘Alī, and further believed in all-encompassing incarnation (i.e. the descendance of Allah ﷻ into all of creation). Hence after elaborating on *Tawhīd* and its various levels, based on his understanding, he says:

النتيجة لكل المقامات والتوحيديات عدم رؤية فعل وصفة حتى من الله تعالى، ونفي الكثرة بالكلية،
وشهود الوحدة الصرفة

The result of all the levels and the various types of *Tawhīd* is: not witnessing any action or attribute, even if it be from Allah ﷻ, the complete denial of multiplicity and the observation of a sheer singularity.³

Probably his words ‘not witnessing any action or attribute, even if it be from Allah’ are to emphasise the stance of the *Ittiḥādiyyah*; because envisioning a distinct action and affirming a specific attribute for Allah entails conceding a distinct existence which results in two existences; which according to them is *Shirk*.

1 Sūrah al-Ra‘d: 2.

2 *Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāyah* p. 145.

3 *Ibid.* 134.

He narrates that one of his Imāms said:

لنا مع الله حالات هو هو ونحن نحن، وهو نحن ونحن هو

We experience such conditions with Allah that he is who he is and we are who we are. And at times his is us and we are him.¹

And commenting upon this narration he says:

وكلمات أهل المعرفة خصوصاً الشيخ الكبير محي الدين مشحونة بأمثال ذلك مثل قوله: الحق خلق، والخلق حق، الحق حق، والخلق خلق. وقال في نصوصه: إن الحق المنزه هو الحق المشبه

And the words of the Gnostics, especially the great scholar Muḥy al-Dīn, are filled with such examples. For example he says, “The ultimate truth is the creation; the creation is the ultimate truth. And the ultimate truth is the ultimate truth and the creation is the creation.” And in one of his statements he says, “Verily the transcendent truth is the truth having similarity.” (With the creation)

He then goes on to cite a good few of the statements of Ibn ‘Arabī.² And thereafter says:

لا ظهور ولا وجود إلا له تبارك وتعالى العالم خيال في خيال عند الإحرار

There is no emergence or existence but for him سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. And the world is merely a fantasy within a fantasy according to the elite.³

He also says:

وإذا نظف دار التحقق من غبار الكثرة، وطوى الحجب النورانية والظلمانية ونال مقام التوحيد الذاتي والفناء الكلي تحصل له الاستعادة الحقيقية

1 Ibid. 114

2 *Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāyah* p. 114.

3 Ibid. p. 123.

And when the abode of reality is cleansed from the dust of multiplicity, and the veils of light and darkness are folded and a person attains the level of essential Tawḥīd and complete annihilation of oneself, that is when he will attain the actual refuge...

He then says:

وقوله أياك نعبد رجوع العبد إلى الحق بالفناء الكلي المطلق

And his words ‘Only you do we worship’ refers to the servant returning to the truth by completely becoming absorbed/annihilated in him.¹

Furthermore, you will find that very frequently he draws evidence from the statements of Ibn ‘Arabī, whom he describes as ‘the great scholar², and al-Qawānī, whom he describes as the successor of the great scholar,³ in substantiating his position on *Waḥdat al-Wujūd* (singularity of existence).

From this it is clear that Khomeini was of the view of the proponents of *Ḥulūl* (incarnation) and *Ittiḥād* (singularity of existence).

Thirdly: Claiming Prophethood

The fatuitous ideas of *Taṣawwuf* and the fantasies of philosophy engendered the emergence of eerie views and outright disbelief from him; for Khomeini has sketched four levels for the seeker:

The first journey ends at the stage of *Fanā’*, absorption/annihilation. In it is the concealed secret and extra concealed secret. In this stage Extremities come forth from him due to which he is deemed a disbeliever. Then if divine patronage saves

1 *Sirr al-Ṣalāh* p. 178.

2 See: *Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāyah* p. 84, 94, 112.

3 See: *Ibid.* p. 110..

him he will profess slavery (being a servant) after having expressed divinity,¹ as he alleges.

The second journey according to him ends with his *Wilāyah* (authority) becoming complete. Therein his essence, attributes and actions become absorbed/annihilated in the being of the ultimate truth, his attributes and his actions. In this journey absorption with absorption, which is the most secretive stage, take place, and the process of *Wilāyah* comes to an end.²

As for the third journey, therein he attains *Ṣaḥw*, complete realisation, and subsists by the enablement of Allah. He travels in the realms of *Jabarūt*, divine realm, *Malakūt*, angelic realm, and *Nāsūt*, human realm. He also obtains a share of prophethood, but not the prophethood of legislation. At this stage the third journey ends and he starts the fourth journey.³

And in the fourth journey he becomes a prophet who is endowed with the prophethood of legislation.⁴

Hence the various stages of the journey according to him are: *Fanā'* (absorption/annihilation of the self), *Wilāyah* wherein occurs absorption within the absorption, prophethood without legislation and complete prophethood.

These stages entail that Nubuwwah is obtainable through spiritual exercises, and the physical exertion practices prescribed by the Gnostics. They find their origins in ancient gnostic philosophy. Hence al-Qāḍī 'Ayāḍ states:

ونكفر من ادعى النبوة لنفسه، أو جوز اكتسابها والبلوغ بصفاء القلب إلى مرتبتها كالفلاسفة وغلاة الصوفية

1 *Miṣbāḥ al-Hidāyah* p. 148.

2 Ibid. 148, 149.

3 Ibid. 149.

4 Ibid. (same page).

We excommunicate anyone who claims Nubuwwah for himself or considers it possible to reach its station by virtue of the cleanliness of the heart like the philosophers and the extremist Gnostics.¹

Hence the aforementioned statements of Khomeini entail blatant disbelief, open heresy, the denial of Nubuwwah and the Ambiyā' and leaving the fold of Islam. Apparently he claims that he has passed all these 'stages'... He has furthermore mentioned in his book *al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* that a Shī'ī Jurist is equal in rank with Mūsā and 'Isā.²

It is also important to remember that the station of Imāmah according to them is higher than the station of Nubuwwah, as has passed already³ and will be presented from the statements of Khomeini himself. And despite this Khomeini is not known in Iran but by the title of 'Imām', i.e. by a station which is higher than the position of Nubuwwah according to them.⁴

Murtaḍā Kutbī⁵ and Jan Leon⁶ therefore say that the majority of the Iranian population does not consider Rūḥ Allāh al-Khomeini merely an *Āyat Allāh*, but rather an Imām, a title which was rarely accorded to any in the history of Islam.⁷

One of the Iranian officials, known as Fakhr al-Ḥijāzī, further emphasised this by asserting that Khomeini is greater than the prophets Mūsā and Hārūn. Owing to this he earned the delight of Khomeini who subsequently appointed him as the deputy of Tehran and the head of *Mu'assasah al-Mustaḍ'afīn*, the institution for the poor, the biggest money institution in the country.⁸

1 *Al-Shifā'* 2/1070-1071.

2 *Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 95.

3 See p. 891 of this book.

4 Because the term 'Imām' according to the Shī'ah is very different from its understanding according to the Ahl al-Sunnah, the attention of the Ahl al-Sunnah is not drawn to the problematic implications thereof when it is used by the Shī'ah.

5 The lecturer on Social sciences in the University of Tehran.

6 A French Journalist.

7 *Al-Mujtama' wa al-Dīn 'ind al-Imām al-Khumainī*, p. 216.

8 Mūsā al-Mūsawī: *al-Thawrah al-Bā'isah* p. 147.

Similarly, we also find Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah hinting that Khomeini is superior to the Nabī of Allah Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. He says:

وقال السيد المعلم (يعني الخميني) ص ١١١ من الحكومة الإسلامية: لماذا الخوف؟ فليكن حبسا أو نفيا أو قتلا فإن أولياء الله يشرون أنفسهم ابتغاء مرضاة الله.

And the master teacher (i.e. Khomeini) has said on p. 111 of his book *al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah*, “Why fear? Let it be imprisonment, exile or murder, for the friends of Allah have sold their souls for the pleasure of Allah.”

Then commenting upon this statement of Khomeini he says:

وليس هذه الكلمات مجرد سورة من سورات الغضب كما فعل موسى (ع) حين ألقى الألواح (التوراة) وأخذ برأس أخيه يجره، بل تنبي أيضا على العلم والمنطق الصارم دون أن تلتفحه نار العاطفة

These words are not merely an outburst from the outbursts of anger like in the case of Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام when he through the tablets (the Torah) and grabbed the head of his brother pulling him. Rather they smack off knowledge and sound reasoning which do not emerge from inflamed emotions.¹

These are the exact words of Mughniyah. They suggest that Khomeini is more perfect than the Nabī of Allah, Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, and that the doings of Khomeini are based upon knowledge and reason and that of Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام upon emotion and anger.

Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام is greater and nobler then can be compared with the most pious of people. How can Khomeini then be better than him and mentioned alongside him when drawing a comparison? But this is sadly the reasoning of the extremists and fanatics whose hearts are empty of the respect of Ambiyā’ of Allah and His Messenger; their extremism regarding their Imāms has emptied their hearts from the grand status of prophethood and those who were chosen by Allah to assume it.

1 *Al-Khumainī wa al-Dawlah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 107.

It is also reported that Khomeini added his name in the call of Adhān and placed it before the *Shahādatān* (the two professions of faith). Pr. Mūsā al-Mūsawī¹ says:

أدخل الخميني اسمه في أذان الصلوات، وقدم اسمه حتى على اسم النبي الكريم، فأذان الصلوات في إيران بعد استلام الخميني للحكم، وفي كل جوامعها كما يلي: الله أكبر، الله أكبر، خميني رهبر، أي إن الخميني هو القائد، ثم أشهد أن محمدا رسول الله

Khomeini added his name of the Adhān of the Ṣalāḥs and placed his name even before the name of Nabī ﷺ. Hence, after Khomeini came into power, the Adhān of the Ṣalāḥs in Iran and in all its central mosques is as follows: *Allah Akbar, Allah Akbar, Khomeini Rehbar*, i.e. al-Khomeini is the commander, and that is followed by *Ashhadu Ann Muḥammad Rasūl Allah*.²

(The aforementioned author has not made mention of testimony that there is no deity besides Allah, probably it is a mistake from his side).

In conclusion, if their scholar Ibn Bābawayh, who belongs to the fourth century, considers the addition *Ashhadu Ann ‘Aliyyan Walī Allah* (I testify that ‘Alī is the friend of Allah) to be a fabrication of the Mufawwiḍah,³ upon who may the curse of Allah descend,⁴ you will realise to what extent the contemporaries have parted from the way of the ancients. You will also realise that all the differences between the contemporaries and the extremists have become obliterated thereby resulting in them having no limits whatsoever at which they stop in making their dogma steep further in fanaticism and heresy.

1 He is the grandson of their scholar Abū al-Ḥasan al-Mūsawī al-Aṣḥānī and is a teacher who holds a doctorate from the University of Tehran and the University of Paris. He has served in various universities in the faculties of theology and economics.

2 *Al-Thawrah al-Bā‘isah* p. 162-163; see also: ‘Abd al-Jabbār al-‘Umar: *al-Khumainī Bayn al-Dīn wa al-Dawlah* p. 6.

3 The Mufawwiḍah: an extremist Shī‘ī sect who believed that Allah created Muḥammad and handed the creation or the universe and its administration of the universe to him. He in turn handed the administration thereof to ‘Alī and he is thus the second administrator. (See: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* 1/88; *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* p. 251; *l’itiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn wa al-Mushrikīn* p. 90; *al-Khuṭa‘ of al-Muqri‘ī*: 2/351; and from the books of the Shī‘ah refer to the following: *al-Mufīd: Taṣṣīḥ al-I’tiqād* p. 64-65; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 25/345.

4 See: *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh* 1/188-189.

Fourthly: Extremism in Shī'ī Belief

Regarding the leanings of Khomeini in Shī'ism, he is inclined toward the fanatical dogma of the *Ghulāh* (extremist).¹ The evidence for this is that he draws evidence from the statements of these extremists in establishing the virtue of the Imāms over the Ambiyā' of Allah and His Messengers. He thus says:

إن من ضرورات مذهبنا أن لا نؤمن بمقام لا يبلغه ملك ومقرب ولا نبي مرسل... وقد ورد عنهم (ع) أن لنا مع الله حالات لا يسعها ملك مقرب ولا نبي مرسل

From the undisputable beliefs of our dogma is the belief that our Imāms enjoy such a high rank that cannot be reached by any close angel or sent prophet...It has been reported from them عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, "We experience such conditions with Allah which are not behaving for any close angel or any sent prophet."²

This was the stance of the extremists, as is established by 'Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī,³ al-Qāḍī 'Ayāḍ⁴ and Ibn Taymiyah.⁵

As you have noticed, Khomeini attributes this position to all the contemporaries and asserts that it is an undisputable fact according to them. Based upon this, the contemporaries are from the extremist Shī'ah according to the scholars of Islam.

Not only according to the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah, but the beliefs of Khomeini are the beliefs of the extremists even according to the leading scholars of the Shī'ah belonging to the fourth century. The evidence for this is that he considers his Imāms free from forgetfulness and inattentiveness.⁶ This belief according to

1 Due to his obsession with the name 'Rāfiḍah' he has named one of his books *Durūs fī al-Jihād wa al-Rafḍ* (lessons regarding Jihād and Rafḍ).

2 *Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 52.

3 *Uṣūl al-Dīn* p. 298.

4 *Al-Shifā'* 2/290.

5 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/177.

6 *Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 91.

their scholar Ibn Bābawayh, who is accorded the title ‘*Raʿīs al-Muḥaddithīn*’ (the chief of the ḥadīth scholars), is the belief of the extremists and the Mufawwiḍah regarding the Imāms; Ibn Bābawayh considers them to be worthy of being cursed, for he says:

إن الغلاة والمفوضة-لعنهم الله- ينكرون سهو النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم

The extremists and the Mufawwiḍah, may Allah curse them, deny the forgetting of Nabī ﷺ.¹

Ibn Bābawayh likewise narrates from his teacher Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Walīd that he considered the denial of forgetfulness of Nabī ﷺ to be an extremist view.² And in his book *al-Iʿtiqād* he gives the following verdict regarding the extremists and the Mufawwiḍah:

اعتقادنا في الغلاة والمفوضة أنهم كفار بالله جل اسمه، وأنهم شر من اليهود والنصارى والمجوس

Our belief regarding the extremists and the Mufawwiḍah is that they disbelieve in Allah whose name is great, and that they are worse than the Jews, Christians and the Fire-worshippers.³

In all his other beliefs, his views are not any different from the views of the Twelvers which we have discussed in the previous pages.

He excommunicates the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ in specific⁴ and the Ahl al-Sunnah in general; so much so that he describes them as ‘*Nawāṣib*’ (the enemies

1 *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh* 1/234.

2 Ibid.

3 *al-Iʿtiqādāt* p. 109.

4 To the extent that in his book *Taḥrīr al-Wasīlah* he establishes the legitimacy of disassociating with the enemies of Islam (and the enemies of Islam according to the Shīʿah are the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ with the exception of three or seven). See *Taḥrīr al-Wasīlah* 1/169. Likewise in his book *Kashf al-Asrār* he emphatically excommunicates Shaykhayn ﷺ. See: *Kashf al-Asrār* p. 112, onwards; also see: al-Nadwī: *Ṣūratān Mutaḍāddatān* p. 57-58; Muḥammad Manẓūr Nuʿmānī: *al-Thawrah al-Irānīyah fī Mīzān al-Islām* p. 48, onwards.

of the Ahl al-Bayt) with the exception of those who they term the *Mustaḍ'afūn* (weak).¹ Instead he is inclined to the extreme most position in this regard, i.e. he averred that the Ahl al-Sunnah should be treated like the non-Muslim enemy. He says:

والأقوى إلحاق الناصب بأهل الحرب في إباحة ما اعتنم منهم وتعلق الخمس به، بل الظاهر جواز أخذ ماله أينما وجد، وبأي نحو كان ووجوب أخراجه خمسه

And the more preferred view is that a Nāṣibī be treated like the non-Muslim foe in terms of that which is taken as booty from them being permissible and *Khums* being extracted therefrom. Rather what is obvious is that it is permissible to take his wealth wherever he is found and in whichever way possible, together with extracting its *Khums* being compulsory.²

The people intended by the term 'Nāṣibī' is the Ahl al-Sunnah and those Shī'ah who are like them, i.e. the Zaydiyyah (besides the Jārūdiyyah, as has passed), not the Khawārij only who are the Nawāṣib according to the Ahl al-Sunnah due to them unanimously excommunicating Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī عليه السلام. This is clear from the fact that he mentions the Khawārij as a different category alongside the Nawāṣib, like in the following statement:

وأما النواصب والخوارج لعنهم الله تعالى فهما نجسان

As for the Nawāṣib and the Khawārij, may Allah curse them, they are impure...³

Furthermore, regarding their belief of the interpolation of the Qur'ān, Khomeini suggests that he accepts the fable that 'Alī عليه السلام had a Qur'ān which he presented to the Ṣaḥābah عليهم السلام which they rejected, and that it contained additions which are not in the present Qur'ān. He says:

1 Refer to p. 1225 of this book footnote 2.

2 *Taḥrīr al-Wasīlah* 1/352; *Wa Jā' Dawr al-Majūs* p. 186.

3 *Taḥrīr al-Wasīlah* 1/118.

ولعل القرآن الذي جمعه (يعني عليا) وأراد تبليغه على الناس بعد رسول الله هو القرآن الكريم مع جميع الخصوصيات الدخيلة في فهمه المضبوطة عنده بتعليم رسول الله.

Probably the Qur'ān which he ('Alī) compiled and intended to convey to the people after Rasūl Allah is the actual Qur'ān entailing all its internal specialities exclusive to his understanding and preserved by him due to the teaching of Rasūl Allah.¹

He likewise supplicates for the mercy of Allah to descend upon the heretic and fire worshipper, the author of *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*. He quotes from his book *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* and uses its content in substantiation of his arguments.² He likewise draws from their classical works which contain the heresy of interpolation, like the *al-Kāfi* of al-Kulaynī³ and the *al-Iḥtijāj* of al-Ṭabarsī,⁴ among others.

In addition to that, al-Nadwī has mentioned, in his translation of some of the texts of *Kashf al-Asrār* that which entails that al-Khomeini openly proclaimed this disbelief.⁵ In the translated text of *Kashf al-Asrār* which I present ahead Khomeini replies to the Question: why are the Imāms not mentioned in the Qur'ān, with the following:

إن الذين لم يكن ارتباطهم بالإسلام والقرآن إلا لأجل الرئاسة والدنيا، وكانوا يجعلون القرآن وسيلة لمقاصدهم الفاسدة، كان من الممكن أن يحرفوا هذا الكتاب السماوي في حالة ذكر اسم الإمام في القرآن وأن يمسحوا هذه الآيات منه وأن يلصقوا وصمة العار هذه على حياة المسلمين.

It is very possible that those who had no link with Islam and the Qur'ān but for leadership of this world and for exploiting it for their corrupt purposes would interpolate this Divine Book where it made mention of the name of

1 *Risālah fī al-Ta'ādul wa al-Tarjīh* p. 26 (included in the second vol. of the letters and booklets of Khomeini).

2 *Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 77.

3 *Ibid.* p. 62, 63, 94.

4 *Ibid.* p. 77.

5 *Ṣūratān Mutaḍāddatān* p. 58.

the Imām and erase those verses from it thereby tainting the reputation of the Muslims.¹

Here he has not emphatically mentioned that interpolation occurred in the Qur’ān but merely hinted to it. But he clearly states that it is possible for someone to interpolate the Qur’ān whereas that entails belying the verse:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ

Indeed, it is We who sent down the message [i.e., the Qur’ān], and indeed, We will be its guardian.²

Look at his fanatical and obscure reasoning, he claims that Allah ﷻ did not make mention of the fundamental most aspect of Dīn, according to them, due to the fear that the Ṣaḥābah would interpolate it.

Furthermore, Khomeini also believed in the preposterous beliefs of *Ghaybah* and *Raj’ah*. In fact he says:

لقد جاء الأنبياء جميعاً من أجل إرساء قواعد العدالة في العالم لكنهم لم ينجحوا حتى النبي محمد خاتم الأنبياء الذي جاء لإصلاح البشرية... لم ينجح في ذلك وإن الشخص الذي سينجح في ذلك هو المهدي المنتظر

All the Ambiyā’ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام came to ground the foundations of justice in this world but were unsuccessful. To the extent that even Muḥammad, the seal of the Ambiyā’ who came to reform humanity, did not succeed. The one person who will be successful in this will be the awaited Mahdī.³

1 *Kashf al-Asrār* p. 114.

2 *Sūrah al-Ḥijr*: 9.

3 This was extracted from a talk Khomeini gave at the occasion of celebrating the birth of the Mahdī, according to their belief, on the fifteenth of Sha’bān 1400 A.H this talk was broadcasted by the radio of Tehran. (*Al-Ra’y al-‘Ām al-Kuwaitiyyah*, Kuwaiti newspaper published on the seventeenth of Sha’bān 1400 A.H.; *Majallah al-Mujtama’ al-Kuwaitiyyah*: edition no. 488, published on 8/7/1980; Aḥmad al-Afghānī: *Sarāb fī Īrān* p. 41-42; *Nahj al-Khumainī* p. 45-47).

The Muslims condemned these words of Khomeini. The Rābiṭah al-‘Ālam al-Islāmī published a statement saying that they were in complete contradiction with Islam, what is found in the Qur’ān, the Prophetic Sunnah, and the consensus of the Ummah.¹ Likewise disapproval had been sounded from a number of places.²

Furthermore, the Magazine of al-Jamā‘ah al-Islāmiyyah in Pakistan published the speech of Khomeini and commented upon it by saying that it entails the denial of Islam and the history of Islam, and it is a matter which not even the likeminded can tolerate.³

In this statement of his he has not parted from the extremist tendencies of his dogma, hence in his view the Imāms, amongst who is the Mahdī, are better than the Ambiyā’.

He likewise believes that all the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ turned renegade after the demise of Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ due to pledging allegiance to Abū Bakr rather than ‘Alī, and that the very crux of the prophethood of Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was the establishment of the Imāmah of ‘Alī; He thus says:

يعتبر الرسول لو لا تعيينه الخليفة من بعده غير مبلغ للرسالة

Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ would be considered not having conveyed the message had he not appointed the Khalīfah after him.

And it is based upon this idea that he averred that Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was not successful, i.e. because ‘Alī did not assume the Khilāfah immediately after him.

1 See the condemnation thereof in *Jarīdah al-Madīnah* (of Saudi), fourth of Ramaḍān 1400 A.H.; *Jarīdah Akhbār al-‘Ālam al-Islāmī*, ninth of Ramaḍān 1400 A.H.

2 The scholars of Morocco published a statement in this regard which was published in *Majallah Da‘wah al-Ḥaqq*, fourth edition, published in Sha‘bān-Ramaḍān; see *Nahj al-Khumainī* p. 49.

3 In the edition which was published on the twenty ninth of Dhī al-Ḥijjah 1404 A.H. See *Nahj Khumainī fī Mīzān al-Fikr al-Islāmī* p. 52.

Nonetheless, subsequent to this, Khomeini published a statement wherein he provided answers for the objections of the objectors. But in his answer there is nothing besides further enforcing this preposterous belief. He says:

ونقول بأن الأنبياء لم يوفقوا في تنفيذ مقاصدهم، وإن الله يسبعث في آخر الزمان شخصا يقوم بتنفيذ مسائل الأنبياء.

We aver that the Ambiyā' were not blessed in fulfilling their objectives, and that Allah ﷻ will send at the end of time a person who will take up the duty of fulfilling the tasks of the Ambiyā'.

He thereafter condemns the objectors and says that they are striving to create disunity amongst the Muslims.¹

Moving on, Khomeini asserts that the teaching of the Imāms are just like the teachings of the Qur'ān.² Instead he practices upon the fables of *al-Riqā'* and accords it the same extent of importance which the Ummah accords to the Qur'ān and the Sunnah of Nabī ﷺ.³ Likewise all the beliefs espoused by the Twelvers are the beliefs of Khomeini. In some of them at times he takes upon a severer level of extremism which we have no need to delve into; because the only purpose of this discussion is clarifying that Khomeini was not after all as the people with shallow knowledge regarded him.

However, I noticed that some people claim that Khomeini gave up some of his views regarding *Taqiyyah*⁴ and ordered his followers to perform ṣalāh with the Ahl al-Sunnah, which outwardly suggest that he was upright.

The answer to this is found in his booklet *al-Ta'ādul wa al-Tarjīh* and in his booklet on *Taqiyyah*. It is sufficient to know that according to him the basis of their

1 Khomeini: *Mas'alah al-Mahdī al-Muntaẓar* (with another booklet) p. 22.

2 *Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 113.

3 He actually uses those narrations to prove the legitimacy of his theory *Wilāyah al-Faqīh* (see: *al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* 76-77).

4 See: Aḥmad Jalī: *Dirāsah 'an al-Firaq* p. 154-155.

religion is opposition of the Ahl al-Sunnah and that this principle is the deciding factor in the case of conflicting narrations. Hence he says:

إن أخبارهم الآمرة بالأخذ بخلاف العامة... كقوله: ما خالف العامة ففيه الرشاد... وقوله: دعوا ما وافق القوم فإن الرشد في خلافهم هي من أصول الترجيح. وليس الترجيح بها بمحض التعبد، بل لكون المخالفة لهم طريقا إلى الواقع، والرشد في خالفهم.

Their narrations which contain the order of opposing the commonality, like the narration: 'There is guidance in that which goes against the commonality' and the narration: 'leave that which is in harmony with the people, for guidance is in opposing them', are from the principles of giving preference. And giving preference based on them is not merely an act of worship (without any logical reasoning), but because their opposition being a very practical way wherein is guidance.¹

He then establishes a chapter with the title: 'narrations which are regarding opposing the commonality'.² In this chapter he cites to types of narrations: 1) narrations which contain the order of adopting the views which oppose the commonality when there is conflict between the narrations of the Imāms, and 2) narrations which contain the order of unconditional opposition.

He mentions five narrations under the first category:

He says:

عن الحسن بن الجهم قال: قلت للعبد الصالح... يروى عن أبي عبد الله عليه السلام شيء يروى عنه خلافة فبأيها نأخذ؟ فقال: خذ بما خالف القوم وما وافق القوم فاجتنبه

Al-Ḥasan ibn al-Jahm says, I asked the pious servant,³ "Something is narrated from Abū 'Abd Allah عليه السلام and at times the very opposite of it

1 *Al-Ta'ādul wa al-Tarjīh* p. 71.

2 *Ibid.* p. 80.

3 i.e. the Imām.

is narrated from him as well. So which one should we practice?" He said, "Practice that which opposes the people and that which is in harmony with them refrain from it."¹

The other four narrations are not any different in their purport. However in some of them is contained the order to assess them by comparing them with the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah:

فاعرضوهما على أخبار العامة فما وافق أخبارهم فذروه وما خالف أخبارهم فخذوه

Present them (conflicting narrations) upon the narrations of the commonality. Then leave whatever is in harmony with their narrations and take whatever opposes their narrations.²

After presenting these narrations Khomeini makes the following remarks:

ولا يخفى وضوح دلالة هذه الأخبار على أن مخالفة العامة مرجحة في الخبرين المتعارضين مع اعتبار سند بعضها، بل صحة بعضها على الظاهر واشتهار مضمونها بين الأصحاب، بل هذا المرجح هو المتداول العام الشائع في جميع أبواب الفقه وألسنة الفقهاء

The purport of these narrations is clear in that the opposition of the commonality is a preference indicator in two conflicting narrations, alongside (the other indicators like) considering the chain of transmission in some, instead its outward authenticity and its publicity amongst the scholars. In fact this preference indicator is what is most commonly applied in all the chapters of *Fiqh* and via the tongues of the Jurists.³

As you can see, Khomeini emphasises upon the importance of shunning all narrations which agree with the Ahl al-Sunnah, as if they are Jews and Christians whose imitation is impermissible. Some of their narrations actually state that the Ahl al-Sunnah are more steeped in disbelief than the Jews and the Christians.⁴

1 Ibid. 80-81.

2 Ibid. p. 80-81.

3 *Al-Ta'ādul wa al-Tarjīh* p. 82.

4 See p. 969 onwards of this book.

As for the second type of narrations, they consist of instructions to unrestrictedly oppose the Ahl al-Sunnah, doing so by investigating the doings of the Ahl al-Sunnah, their views, and their beliefs only to thereafter oppose them. Under this type he mentions five narrations.

The first narrations orders the Shī'ī to seek a fatwa in order to practice the opposite of it. It states:

ائت فقيه البلد فاستفته من أمرك فإذا أفتاك بشيء فخذ بخلافه فإن الحق فيه

Go to the Jurist of the town and seek a fatwa from him regarding your issue. And when he gives you a fatwa then practice upon its opposite, for verily in it is the truth.¹

This narration and other narrations of its like have posed a problem for the Shī'ah. That is because in the reports of the Ahl al-Sunnah, especially in the chapter of jurisprudence, there are many narrations which are in accordance with the narrations of the Shī'ah. Hence if the aforementioned narrations are practiced unrestrictedly it can lead to abandoning both dogmas all together. It is for this reason that Khomeini has tried to resolve this dilemma by commenting upon each of these narrations. He thus makes the following remarks after the aforementioned narration:

موردها صورة الاضطرار وعدم طريق إلى الواقع فأرشده إلى طريق يرجع إليه لدى سد الطرق ولا يستفاد منها جواز رد الخبر من طريقنا إذا كان موافقا لهم

The context wherein it should be practiced is desperation and having no way to the reality. Hence the Imām guided him to a solution when all the ways are barricaded. It is thus not understood from this narration that it is permissible to reject our narration if it is in accordance with them.²

1 Al-Ta'ādul wa al-Tarjīh p. 82.

2 Ibid.

Thereafter he says:

فالظاهر منها المخالفة في عقائدهم وفي أمر الإمامة وما يرتبط بها، ولا تدلان على رد الخبر الموافق لهم

Ostensibly, they refer to opposing them in their beliefs and in the matter of Imāmah and whatever is linked to it. But they do not suggest that a narration which is in harmony with them be rejected.¹

As you might have noticed, Khomeini considers opposing the Ahl al-Sunnah in their principle beliefs to be a preference factor according to them. So where are those who extend their hands to unite with him? And where are those who claim that he no more practiced Taqiyyah with the Ahl al-Sunnah?

Moving on, as for his instruction to some of his followers to read Ṣalāh with the Ahl al-Sunnah, it is part of his practice of Taqiyyah regarding which he has not made any conclusive remarks in his booklet on Taqiyyah. But many of the Ahl al-Sunnah who take things for what they apparently seem without having knowledge of the reality of Shīʿī dogma endorse such steps and enumerate them in the feats of Khomeini and his efforts in uniting the Muslims.²

This is in spite of the fact that he has established a chapter in his booklet on Taqiyyah with the title: ‘narrations which suggest the validity of Ṣalāh with the commonality’. Therein he mentions:

إنه قد وردت روايات خاصة تدل على صحة الصلاة مع الناس والترغيب في الحضور في مساجدهم والاعتداء بها والاعتداد بها كصحيفة حماد بن عثمان عن أبي عبد الله أنه قال: من صلى معهم في الصف الأول كان كمن صلى خلف رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في الصف الأول

There are special narrations which suggest the validity of Ṣalāh performed with the people, and which exhort one to attend their Masjids and follow

1 *Al-Taʾāḍul wa al-Tarjīḥ* p. 83.

2 See what al-Shaykh Muḥammad al-Majdūb has written in the newspaper *al-Madīnah al-Munawwarah*: edition no. 4808, published on 1 Rabīʿ al-Awwal 1400 A.H.

in the Ṣalāh, together with deeming it valid. For example, the authentic narration of Ḥammād ibn ‘Uthmān which he narrates from Abū ‘Abd Allah, “He who reads Ṣalāh with them in the first row is like a person who reads Ṣalāh behind Rasūl Allah ﷺ in the first row.”

Commenting thereupon he says:

ولا ريب أن الصلاة معه - يعني مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم - صحيحة ذات فضيلة جمة فكذلك الصلاة معهم حال التقية

It is without doubt that Ṣalāh with him, i.e. with Rasūl Allah ﷺ, is valid and holds immense virtue. And so is performing Ṣalāh with them whilst practicing Taqiyyah.¹

He thereafter says:

وموثقة سماعه قال: سألته عن مناعتهم والصلاة خلفهم؟ فقال: هذا أمر شديد لن نستطيعوا ذلك قد أنكح رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وصلى علي وراءهم

And Mūthaqah Samā‘ah says, “I asked him regarding marrying them and reading Ṣalāh behind them. He said, “This is a complex issue which you will not be able to withstand. Rasūl Allah ﷺ married (his daughters to them) and ‘Alī performed Ṣalāh behind them.”²

Khomeini then points out that this type of Taqiyyah is not attached to necessity and that it is specifically practiced with the Ahl al-Sunnah; because in his view Taqiyyah can at times be due to necessity in the situation of fear, just as it can at times be due to cajolery; which is when Taqiyyah becomes the best of deeds according to them. As for the first situation, the matter is quite clear. But regarding the second situation he says the following:

1 *Risālah al-Taqiyyah* p. 108 (incorporated in the second volumes of his letters and booklets).

2 *Risālah al-Taqiyyah* p. 198.

وأما التقية المداراتية المرغوب فيها- كذا- مما تكون العبادة معها أحب العبادات وأفضلها، فالظاهر اختصاصها بالتقية عن العامة كما هو مصب الروايات على كثرتها

As for the desired Taqiyyah which is practiced due to cajolery in the presence of which an act of worship becomes the most beloved and virtuous of actions, it is apparently specific to practicing Taqiyyah when dealing with the commonality, as is the focus of the narrations despite their abundance.¹

Hence practicing Taqiyyah with the Ahl al-Sunnah is the best of deeds, and it is unrestrictedly permissible.

Similarly, he points to a third type of Taqiyyah which entails concealment as opposed to exposition. He says:

فتكون على حد تعبيره بمعنى التحفظ عن أفشاء المذهب وعن إفشاء سر أهل البيت

It will thus mean, according to his expression, safeguarding against exposing the dogma and the secret of the Ahl al-Bayt.²

Can it still be claimed that Khomeini gave up Taqiyyah and deceit? Those who claim that they were unaware of the various types of Taqiyyah and that practicing it with the Ahl al-Sunnah is the best of deeds and that it is not necessarily associated with need.

In conclusion, it is sufficient for you to know that he considers the era of the Khulafā' Rāshidūn to be the era of Taqiyyah. He says:

إن من بعد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلى زمان خلافة أمير المؤمنين ومن بعده إلى زمن الغيبة كان الأئمة وشيعتهم مبتلين بالتقية أكثر من مائتي سنة

1 Ibid. p. 200.

2 Ibid. 184.

From the era of Rasūl Allah ﷺ to the Khilāfah of Amīr al-Mu'minīn, and from his time till the era of occultation, the Imāms and their Shī'ah were compelled to practice Taqiyyah for more than two hundred years.¹

It is clear that Khomeini was from the extremist Shī'ah. In some cases he actually adopted views which were more reprehensible than the prevalent views. He would deliberately oppose the Ahl al-Sunnah, and at times when otherwise was seen it was due to Taqiyyah.

Fifthly: His view regarding the Comprehensive Authority of the Jurist

The Twelvers believe that comprehensive authority over the Muslims is the exclusive right of a few individuals whose names and amount are stipulated, and whom Allah ﷻ has chosen just like he chose the Ambiyā' عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ.² The orders given by these individuals are like the orders of Allah; their infallibility is like the infallibility of the Rusul, Messengers of Allah; and their virtue is like the virtue of the Ambiyā'.

However the last of these Imāms, according to them, is in occultation since the year 260 A.H, owing to which they consider it impermissible for anyone to assume the position of leadership till his emergence. Hence they say:

كل راية ترفع قبل أن يقوم القائم فصاحبها طاغوت وإن كان يدعو إلى الحق

Every flag which is raised before the emergence of the guardian, its bearer is a devil even though he calls toward the truth.³

The Shī'ah of the bygone centuries lived by this. However, they managed to secure official permission from the absent Imām for their scholars to assume some of the tasks which are exclusively his prerogative, not all. This official permission states:

1 Ibid. 296.

2 Refer to the discussion of Imāmāh.

3 This has passed already on p. 1003.

As for the issues which newly arise, refer in them to the narrators of our legacy.¹

It is clear from this permission that he is ordering them to refer to the scholars in order to learn the rulings of newly arising issues. Therefore, the Shī'ah ultimately agreed that the representational authority of their scholars was restricted to the services of issuing Fatwas and its like. As for complete authority which includes, politics and establishing a state, it is the exclusive domain of the absent Imām and will remain suspended till his arrival. It is for this reason that the adherents of this dogma lived for centuries considering the leaders of the Muslims to be usurpers and lamented over the fact that they forcibly took control of the leadership of their Imām. They would thus supplicate to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى at every moment to expedite his release so that he may establish their desired state and in the meanwhile practiced according to the dictates of Taqiyyah with the existing empires. But the occultation of the Imām stretched and continued for almost twelve centuries without him emerging. As a result the Shī'ah remained deprived of an empire based upon their dogma. The idea that the duties of the Mahdī be passed on to the scholars began to play on the minds of some of their later scholars at this time.

Hence Khomeini has indicated that their scholars al-Nirāqī (d. 1245 A.H.)² and al-Nā'īnī (d. 1355 A.H.)³ both were of the view that the jurist can preside over all the duties and activities of the Imām pertaining to rulership, administration and politics.⁴

Besides the aforementioned, Khomeini has not made mention of any other earlier scholars who propounded the same. Had he found any of them averring

1 See p. 1208 of this book.

2 Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad Mahdī al-Nirāqī al-Kāshānī (1185 A.H. to 1245 A.H.)

3 Ḥusain ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Najafī al-Nā'īnī (1273 A.H. to 1355 A.H.)

4 *Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 74.

the same he would have made mention of them in order to justify his position. Therefore, the conclusion is that the idea of the comprehensive representational authority of the jurist was not found in the Shīr dogma before the thirteenth century. Khomeini thus latched onto the views of those before him and began propagating this idea coupled with propagating the need for an empire which is administered by the representative of the Imām in order to implement and enforce the Shīr dogma. He says:

واليوم- في عهد الغيبة- لا يوجد نص على شخص معين يدير شؤون الدولة، فما هو الرأي؟ هل تترك أحكام الإسلام معطلة؟ أم نرغب بأنفسنا عن الإسلام؟ أم نقول: إن الإسلام جاء ليحكم الناس قرنين من الزمان فحسب ليهملهم بعد ذلك؟ أو نقول: إن الإسلام قد أهمل أمور تنظيم الدولة؟ ونحن نعلم أن عدم وجود الحكومة يعني ضياع ثغور الإسلام وانتهاكها، ويعني تخاذلنا عن أرضنا، هل يسمح في ذلك في ديننا؟ أليست الحكومة ضرورة من ضرورات الحياة؟

Today -in the era of occultation- there is no emphatic text regarding a specific person who will administer the affairs of the empire. So what should the approach be? Should the injunctions of Islam be left altogether? Should we avert ourselves from Islam? Or should we say that Islam only came to rule over people for two centuries and thereafter neglect them? Should we say that Islam has neglected the matters of running a government? We know that the non-existence of a government entails the loss of the Islamic boundaries and its deterioration, just as it entails our negligence in safeguarding our lands. Can this be allowed in our Dīn? Is not government a necessity from the necessities of life?¹

And in another place he says:

قد مر على الغيبة الكبرى لإمامنا المهدي أكثر من ألف عام، وقد تمر ألوف السنين قبل أن تقتضي المصلحة قدوم الإمام المنتظر في طول هذه المدة المديدة، هل تبقى أحكام الإسلام معطلة؟ يعمل الناس من خلالها ما يشاؤون؟ ألا يلزم من ذلك الهرج والمرج؟ القوانين التي صدع بها نبي الإسلام صلى الله عليه وسلم وجهد في نشرها وبيانها وتنفيذها طيلة ثلاثة وعشرين عاما، هل كان كل ذلك لمدة محدودة؟ هل حدد الله عمر الشريعة بمائتي عام مثلا؟ الذهاب إلى هذا الرأي أسوأ في نظري من الاعتقاد بأن الإسلام منسوخ

1 Ibid, p. 48.

More than a thousand years have passed upon the major occultation of our Imam Mahdī, and probably another thousands of years will pass before circumstances demand that his emergence takes place. So will the injunctions of Islam remain neglected throughout this lengthy period wherein people will as a result practice whatever they want to? Will this not inevitably lead to massacre and disorder? All the laws which were legislated by the Nabī of Islam and which he strove to propagate, explain and implement for twenty three years, was all of that for a limited time only? Has Allah ﷻ limited the life of Sharī'ah to two hundred years, for example? Leaning toward this view according to me is worse than believing that Islam has been abrogated.¹

He then says:

إذن فإن كل من يتظاهر بالرأي القائل بعدم ضرورة تشكيل الحكومة الإسلامية فهو ينكر ضرورة تنفيذ أحكام الإسلام، ويدعو إلى تعطيلها وتجميدها، وهو ينكر بالتالي شمول وخلود الدين الإسلامي الحنيف

Hence anyone who is inclined to the view that there is no need to give shape to an Islamic government is in reality denying the necessity of implementing the laws of Islam; he is advocating its neglect and its subsequent stagnation. And he is, consequently, denying the comprehensive and perpetual nature of the pure religion of Islam.²

Owing to these justifications, Khomeini saw the need for a Shī'ī jurist and his followers to initiate an uprising in order to gain power and rule over the lands of Islam, doing so by representing the Mahdī. But by doing so Khomeini violated many of the established principles of their dogma and opposed the emphasised bequests of their Imāms regarding the importance of anticipating the emergence of the absent Imām and not hastening in leading rebellions.³

1 Ibid. 26.

2 Ibid. 26-27.

3 See p. 1442 of this book.

Hence one of their scholars and authorities in this era says:

وقد توافرت عنهم (ع) حرمة الخروج على أعدائهم وسلاطين عصرهم

The impermissibility of revolting against their enemies and the rulers of their times has been diffusely narrated from them (the Imāms).¹

This is because the station of Imāmah according to them is only suitable for a person who is emphatically appointed by Allah and their silence thus does not necessarily entail their approval of other governments.

However, all these justifications which Khomeini has mentioned in order to legitimate the Shīʿī empire and the representation of the Mahdī could have been diverted in another direction had the scholars of the Shīʿah been sincere in their speech and well-wishers for their followers, i.e. toward analysing the dogma from its very basis, the fable of occultation and the anticipation of the absent Imam, which has led to such an abysmal end.

Nonetheless, this is a very important attestation from this scholar and authority regarding the Shīʿī dogma being corrupt from its very basis, the consensus of its adherents throughout history being based upon falsehood and their idea of emphatic appointment of a specific Imām, regarding which they animatedly disputed with the Ahl al-Sunnah for years and due to which they excommunicated them, being baseless as per the evidence provided by history and reality. And now you see that they have become compelled to oppose their own Imām with the idea of ‘the comprehensive representation of the jurist’ after the times have prolonged upon them and after losing hope in the emergence of the one they call ‘the man of the time’. And as a result they laid claim to all his capabilities. Khomeini specifically allocated all his duties and responsibilities to himself and to some of the jurists who were like him in their thinking and dogma due to

1 Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī al-Baghdādī (also known by the title: ‘the greatest Āyah and the highest religious authority’): *Wujūb al-Nahḍah li Ḥifẓ al-Bayḍah* p. 93.

seeing the need for taking care of the duties of the absent Imām in administering the state. And in order to satisfy his followers he wrote the books *al-Ḥukūmat al-Islāmiyyah* and *Wilāyat al-Faqīh*.

Furthermore, Khomeini does not agree with anyone presiding over the matters of the state, rather he restricts that to the jurists of the Shī'ah; he restricts rulership and leadership to them. Hence he says:

وبالرغم من عدم وجود نص على شخص من ينوب عن الإمام (ع) حال غيبته، إلا أن خصائص الحاكم الشرعي... موجودة في معظم فقهاء عصرنا، فإذا أجمعوا أمرهم كان في ميسورهم إيجاد وتكوين حكومة عادلة منقطعة النظير

Despite the absence of an emphatic text regarding who specifically should represent the Imām in his absence, however, the specialities of a Sharī ruler are found in most of the jurists of our time. Therefore, if they unite it will be very easy for them to give shape to a government unprecedented in its justice.¹

The question though is that does there remain a need for the emergence of the awaited Mahdī when the scholars of the Shī'ah can give shape to a state unprecedented in its justice?

He also avers that the authority of the Shī'ī jurist is just like the authority of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. He says:

فالله جعل الرسول وليا للمؤمنين جميعا... ومن بعده كان الإمام (ع) وليا. ومعنى ولايتهما أن أوامرهما الشرعية نافذة في الجميع

Allah ﷻ appointed the Rasūl as the guardian of all the believers. And after him the Imām ﷺ becomes the guardian. And the implications of the guardianship/authority is that their Sharī rulings apply to all.²

1 *Al-Ḥukūmat al-Islāmiyyah* p. 48-49.

2 *Al-Ḥukūmat al-Islāmiyyah* p. 51.

He then says:

نفس هذه الولاية والحاكمة موجودة لدى الفقيه، بفارق واحد هو أن ولاية الفقيه على الفقهاء الآخرين لا تكون بحيث يستطيع عزلهم أو نصبهم، لأن الفقهاء في الولاية متساوون من ناحية الأهلية

This same level of authority and leadership is available for the jurist, but with one difference, and that is that the authority of the jurist over the other jurists is not such that he can dismiss them or appoint them. This is because in terms eligibility they are all equal in authority.¹

The idea of Khomeini is thus based upon two principles:

1. According to the jurist comprehensive authority.
2. And that only a Shī'ī jurist can assume the leadership of the state.

This is a departure from the belief that the Imāms were divinely appointed and were only twelve number; because the jurists of the Shī'ah are not restricted to a specific number, nor are they appointed emphatically. It also implies that they have returned to the understanding of leadership and Imāmah which the Ahl al-Sunnah hold, to some extent at least, and that they have indirectly confessed that their forefathers and predecessors were deviated.

Nonetheless they consider the idea of 'the authority of the jurist' to be a representation of the Mahdī till he returns and hence have not parted from the official stance of their dogma. That is why, according to me, this idea is no different from the idea of the Bābiyyah; for just as a Bāb claims to be the representative of the Mahdī so does the Shī'ī jurist, with the only difference that Khomeini considers all the scholars to be Bābs, i.e. representatives.

Put another way, Khomeini has made the awaited Mahdī of the Shī'ah emerge; and that is by allocating all his capabilities and duties to a Shī'ī jurist. Instead he

¹ Ibid.

has not made one Mahdī emerge but he has made tens of them emerge due to many of them being capable of holding that office according to him. He says:

إن معظم فقهاءنا في هذا العصر تتوفر فيهم الخصائص التي تؤهلهم للنيابة عن الإمام المعصوم

Most of our jurists in this age possess the special abilities which make them eligible for the representation of the infallible Imām.¹

And owing to this representation their orders hold the same weight as the orders of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. He says:

هم الحجة على الناس كما كان الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم حجة الله عليهم، وكل من يتخلف عن طاعتهم فإن الله يؤاخذ به ويحاسبه على ذلك

They are the evidence upon the people just as Rasūl Allah ﷺ was the evidence of Allah upon them. Hence whoever falls short of obeying them Allah will take him to task.²

He also says:

وعلى كل فقد فوض إليهم الأنبياء جميع ما فوض إليهم واآتمنواهم على ما آؤتمنوا عليه

In essence, the Ambiyā' have handed over to them all the duties that were handed over to them. And they entrusted them with whatever they were entrusted with.³

He likewise says that the state of the Shī'ī jurist is just like the promised state of the Mahdī:

كلما يفقدنا هو عصا موسى وسيف علي بن أبي طالب (ع) وعزيمتهما الجبارة. وإذا عزمنا على إقامة حكم إسلامي سنحصل على عصا موسى وسيف علي بن أبي طالب

1 *Al-Hukūmat al-Islāmiyyah* p. 113.

2 *Ibid.* p. 80.

3 *Ibid.*

All that we are missing is the staff of Mūsā and the sword of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and their great resoluteness; and when we intend to establish an Islamic rule we will obtain both the staff of Mūsā and the sword of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.¹

Combining the staff of Mūsā and the sword of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib is, according to me, emblematic of the collaboration of the Jews with the Shī‘ah in the state of the scholars. The evidence for this is that some of this has already happened in the state of Khomeini, as is clear in the deals of weapons and the clandestine assistance which exist between the two as was reported by the agencies of news and is famous.

In addition, Khomeini admits that the Shī‘ah of the past did not venture on giving shape to a Shī‘ī state. He says:

في السابق لم نعمل ولم ننهض سوية لتشكيل حكومة تحطم الخائنين المفسدين

In the past we had not strove and risen fully to give shape to a government which would destroy the mischief making traitors.²

Likewise he says:

ولم تسنح الفرصة لأئمتنا للأخذ بزمام الأمور، وكانوا بانتظارها حتى آخر لحظة من الحياة، فعلى الفقهاء العدول أن يتحينوا هم الفرص ويتنهمزها من أجل تنظيم وتشكيل حكومة

The opportunity was never opportune for our Imāms to take hold of the reign of affairs. And they were waiting for it till the last moment of their lives. Hence it is the responsibility of the jurist to anticipate opportunities and take advantage of them in order to give shape to a government.³

1 These are part of the things the Mahdī allegedly inherited from the Ambiyā’ and the Imāms (*Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/231).

2 Ibid. p. 40.

3 *Al-Ḥukūmat al-Islāmiyyah* p. 54.

It is crucial to note that there were Shī'ī empires that rose and fell in the past, but because they were not ruled by the scholars and the 'representatives of the infallible Imām' they were not considered to be Islamic. Hence they consider their state to be the first Islamic, i.e. Shī'ī, state. One of the Shī'ah scholars says:

إن الخميني أسس الجمهورية الإسلامية العظمى في إيران لأول مرة في تاريخ الإسلام وحقق حلم الأنبياء
والرسول الأعظم صلى الله عليه وسلم والأئمة المعصومين عليهم السلام

Khomeini laid the foundation of the greatest Islamic republic in Iran for the first time in the history of Islam. He fulfilled the dream of the Ambiyā' and the greatest Prophet ﷺ and the infallible Imāms.¹

Furthermore, their scholar al-Ṭāliqānī opines that the government of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and his Khulafā' cannot match with their state and that the former merely paved the way for the establishment of the latter. He says:

إننا نعتقد أن الجمهورية الإسلامية هي المؤهلة للحياة في هذا الزمان، ولم تكن مؤهلة للحياة في فجر الإسلام... إن التحولات الاجتماعية والسياسية التي شهدتها العالم منذ الرسول الخلفاء الراشدون وحتى اليوم هي التي توفر الأساس الموضوعي لقيام الجمهورية الإسلامية

We believe that the Islamic republic is what facilitates life in this era, whereas previously, at the dawn of Islam, it was not such... All the social and political changes which the world has witnessed from the time of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and the rightly guided Khulafā' up to the present day provide the objective foundation for the Islamic republic.²

As you can see, the nature of the Shī'ī viewpoint in anything always progresses in extremism, in consecrating specific individuals and in holding fanatical beliefs, as

1 Aḥmad al-Fihri (also called 'al-'Allāmah, the very knowledgeable): in his introduction to the book *Sirr al-Ṣalāh* of Khomeini (p. 10)

2 This was published by the *al-Safir* magazine of Lebanon on 31-3- 1979; and it was cited by Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah who remarked that it is a novel understanding of the Islamic republic which cannot be advocate but by a person who lives the reality of Islam with his heart and mind! See: *al-Khumaynī wa al-Dawlah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 113.

is obvious in the viewpoint of al-Ṭāliqānī regarding the republic of Iran. Instead some have even went to the extreme that the Imāms had prophesized the coming of Khomeini.¹

Moving on, what the tasks of the Mahdī will be after his return from occultation has previously been mentioned already from the books of the Shī'ah; it was cited that the only duties he will have is killing and taking revenge, to the extent that he will be sent with the *Jafr Aḥmar* (red skin) and slaughter, and that he will carry out all his atrocities against the Arabs.² We see the signs of this alleged task becoming clear in the state of the scholars; for Khomeini and his cohorts have put into motion the institution of the state of the Mahdī by carrying out frightening massacres in and out of Iran.

The reality is that the fabricators of the narrations of the massacre which is promised to take place after the advent of the absent Imām knew very well that the concepts of occultation and the Mahdī are nothing more than fantasies. However they used the forgery of narrations to express the inner sentiments of their hearts and the hatred that they bear. Similar is the case of the scholars of the Shī'ah, most of who are heretics, who know that the concept of the Mahdī is a fable and thus whenever they deem the time opportune to fulfil their hopes of massacring the Muslims they take full advantage of it without waiting for the emergence of their Mahdī; they know very well that he will never emerge and that he does not exist at all.

The clearest evidence in this regard comes from Khomeini himself who in his book *Taḥrīr al-Wasīlah* establishes that due to the absence of the Mahdī it is not permissible to engage in warfare:

في عصر غيبة ولي الأمر وسليطان العصر عجل الله فرجه الشريف يقوم نوابه وهم الفقهاء الجامعون
لشرائط الفتوى والقضاء مقامه في إجرای السياسيات وسائر ما للإمام عليه السلام إلا البدأة بالجهاد

1 Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah: *al-Khumaynī wa al-Dawlah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 38-39.

2 See: p. 1181, onwards of this book.

During the era of the absence of the guardian of the affair and the king of the time, may Allah expedite his noble release, his representatives who are the jurist qualified with all the requisites of fatwa and judicature, will fill his space in implementing all the policies and whatever else is the prerogative of the Imām with the exception of initiating Jihād.¹

But after having established his state he includes the following in its constitution:

إن جيش الجمهورية الإسلامية... لا يتحملان فقط مسؤولية حفظ وحراسة الحدود، وإنما يتكفلان أيضا بحمل رسالة عقائدية أي الجهاد في سبيل الله، والنضال من أجل توسيع حاكمية قانون الله في كافة أرجاء العالم

The army of the Muslim republic... will not only assume the responsibility of safeguarding the borders, but they will also be responsible for carrying a doctrinal message, i.e. doing Jihād in the path of Allah and struggling in order to broaden the comprehensive sovereignty of the law of Allah in all parts of the world.²

The contradiction is abundantly clear; in *Tahrīr al-Wasīlah* he states that Jihād falls part of the duties of the Mahdī and in the constitution of their state he states that it is the responsibility of the army and the jurist. This is due to his new idea of the ‘authority of the jurist’ wherein all the responsibilities of the Mahdī have been passed on to the Shī‘ī jurist. In fact this is clearly mentioned in their constitution:

في زمن غيبة الإمام المهدي عجل الله تعالى فرجه تعتبر ولاية الأمر وإمامة الأمة في جمهورية إيران الإسلامية بيد الفقيه

During the era of the occultation of the Imām Mahdī, may Allah expedite his release, the authority of the affairs and the leadership of the Ummah in the Islamic republic of Iran will be in the hands of the jurist.³

1 *Tahrīr al-Wasīlah* 1/482.

2 *Al-Dustūr li Jumhūriyyah Īrān* (from the publications of Mu’assasah al-Shahīd) p. 16; also see the publication of *Wizārah al-Irshād al-Īrāniyyah*: p. 10.

3 *Dustūr al-Jumhūriyyah al-Islāmiyyah fī Īrān* (*Wizārah al-Irshād al-Īrāniyyah*) p. 18

As a result of this policy, the first thing that they did after the establishment of their state was attack the Muslims with their armies and allies in some parts of the Muslim world. Despite that Khomeini still claimed that these attacks fall under the ambit of defence. No limits indeed to their manipulation. He says:

إننا لا نريد أن نرفع السلاح ونهاجم أحدا. فالعراق يهاجمنا منذ مدة، بينما نحن لا نهاجمه، وإنما ندافع فقط فالدفاع أمر واجب

We do not want to raise weapons and attack anybody, but Iraq has been attacking us for a while now and we have not been attacking it. All we are doing is defending, for defence is compulsory.¹

But contrary to this, he asserts that he wants to export his revolution. He says:

إننا نريد أن نصدر ثورتنا الإسلامية إلى كافة البلاد الإسلامية

We want to export our Islamic revolution to all the Muslims lands.²

He does not intend to do so in peaceful ways, rather he wants to impose his dogma upon the Muslims with force. He indicated to this before the establishment of their state and confirmed that the way to go about achieving this objective is establishing a Shī' state which will take charge of this matter. He says:

ونحن لا نملك الوسيلة إلى توحيد الأمة الإسلامية وتحرير أراضيها من يد المستعمرين وإسقاط الحكومات العميلة لهم، إلا أن نسعى إلى إقامة حكومتنا الإسلامية. وهذه بدورها سوف تتكفل أعمالها بالنجاح يوم تتمكن من تحطيم رؤوس الخيانة، وتدمير الأوثان والأصنام البشرية التي تنشر الظلم والفساد في الأرض

We have no means to unite the Islamic Ummah,³ free its lands from the hands of the colonialists and overthrow the governments which are their

1 The speech of Khomeini regarding the issue of liberating Palestine and the Mahdī p. 9-10.

2 Ibid. p. 10.

3 i.e. upon the dogma of the Shī'ah.

agents with the exception of striving to establish our Islamic government. This government will crown its activities with success the day it succeeds in destroying the heads of betrayal and the human idols who are spreading oppression and corruption on the earth.¹

Interestingly, these Shī'ah do not criticise the governments for the aforementioned reason, because it is clear that even if a government be the best government on the surface of this earth it would still be despised and attacked by the Shī'ah, unless it is based on their dogma. This is clear from their view regarding the Khilāfah of the three Khulafā' رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.

Nonetheless, the alleged task of the Mahdī slaughtering the Muslims features in the speeches of their scholars who assert that Khomeini will initiate it due to him being the representative of the Mahdī. Owing to their tendency of impatience and lack of concealment, as described by their Imām,² one of their scholars has exposed this particular matter. Hence in an official republican ceremony which was held in Abadan on 17/3/1979 in support of the establishment of the Islamic republic, doctor Muḥammad Mahdī Ṣādiqī delivered a sermon which was transcribed in both Arabic and Persian and which was described by the broadcasting radio as 'important, wherein he said:

أصبح يا إخواني المسلمين في مشارق الأرض ومغاربها أن مكة المكرمة حرم الله الآمن يحتلها شرذمة
أشد من اليهود

I boldly mention, O my Muslims brothers in the east and the west of the earth, that Makkah is currently occupied by a group which is worse than the Jews.

Prior to that he mentioned that if the revolution is successful they will go to al-Quds, Makkah, Afghanistan and different places.³

1 *Al-Ḥukūmat al-Islāmiyyah* p. 35.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 1/222.

3 This sermon was broadcasted from Abadan at 12:00 PM on 17/3/1979; see *Wa jā' Dawr al-Majūs* p. 344-347.

As you have noticed, they consider Makkah to be like al-Quds, i.e. occupied by the Jews, and like Afghanistan which was occupied by the communist. Whereas at the same time you will find that they sympathise with the disbelieving Nuṣayrī ruler of Syria and do not criticise him in any way.

Similarly, the *al-Shahīd* magazine (the voice of the Shīʿī scholars of Qum) in its 46th edition, published on the 16th Shawwāl 1400 A.H., published a picture which represented the blessed Kaʿbah, and next to it was a picture which represented al-Masjid al-Aqṣā, and between them was a hand holding a gun under which was written:

سنحرر القبلتين

We will liberate the two Qiblahs.¹

The Opposition of some of the Shīʿī scholars of the idea of Khomeini regarding the Representational Authority of the Jurist

The idea of Khomeini, which transfers all the tasks and duties of the Mahdī to the jurist and restricts the authoritative leadership to him, induced opposition from many Shīʿah scholars. As a result a very animated dispute broke out between Khomeini and one of their leading scholars and references Sharīʿatmadārī.² A group of their scholars similarly openly announced their opposition of his position.³

1 See the aforementioned edition of the *al-Shahīd* magazine; also see: the Saudi newspaper al-Madīnah, published on 27th of Dhī al-Qaʿdah 1400 A.H.; also see what Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Qādir Āzād (the head of Majlis al-ʿUlamāʾ, Pakistan) has written regarding what he witnessed during his visit of Iran. He says that, on the wall of the Hilton hotel in Tehran where slogans are normally displayed, he saw written 'We will free the Kaʿbah', al-Quds and Palestine from the hands of the disbelievers' (see: Muḥammad Āzād: *al-Fitnah al-Khumainiyyah* p. 9).

2 ʿAbd al-Jabbār al-ʿUmar: *al-Khumaynī bayn al-Dīn wa al-Dawlah*: discussion regarding Khomeini and Sharīʿatmadārī: p. 144, onwards.

3 Ibid. p. 153-154.

Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah likewise displayed his bafflement at the extent to which Khomeini went in asserting his idea, i.e. equalising the capacities of the infallible Imām and the Jurists. He says:

قول المعصوم وأمره تماماً كالنزيل من الله العزيز العليم وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَىٰ ومعنى هذا أن للمعصوم حق الطاعة والولاية على الراشد والقاصر والعالم والجاهل، وإن السلطة الروحية الزمنية-مع وجوده- تنحصر به وحده لا شريك له، وإلا كانت الولاية عليه وليست له، علماً بأنه لا أحد فوق المعصوم عن الخطأ الخطيئة إلا من له الخلق والأمر جل وعز... أبعد هذا يقال: إذا غاب المعصوم انتقلت ولايته بالكامل إلى الفقيه

The verdict of the infallible and his order is just like revelation from Allah the Almighty and the All Knowing. 'Nor does he speak from [his own] inclination. It is not but a revelation revealed.¹ This implies that the infallible possess the right of obedience and leadership over the mature and the immature, the learned and the unlettered. It also implies that the spiritual and time-confined (to his presence) leadership is specific to him alone, without any partner. Or else it would entail that the authority is to his loss and not to his advantage, knowing fully well that there is no one besides Allah in whose control is creation and dominion above the infallible Imām... After this can it still be said that in his absence his authority is fully transferred to the jurist?²

Hence the idea of Khomeini according to him is extremely fanatical due to the problem: how can the ruling of a jurist be equated to the ruling of the infallible Imām. He further explains:

حكم المعصوم متزه عن الشك والشبهات، لأنه دليل لا مدلول، وواقعي لا ظاهري... أما الفقيه فحكمه مدلول يعتمد على الظاهر، وليس هذا فقط، بل هو عرضة للنسيان غلبة الزهو والغرور، والعواطف الشخصية، والتأثير المحيط والبيئة، وتغيير الظروف الاقتصادية والمكانة الاجتماعية، وقد عاينت وعانيت الكثير من الأحكام الجائرة، ولا يتسع المجال للشواهد والأمثال سوى أنني عرفت فقيها بالزهد والتقوى قبل الرئاسة، وبعدها تحدث الناس عن ميله مع الأولاد والأصهار

1 Sūrah al-Najm: 3.

2 *Al-Khumaynī wa al-Dawlah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 59.

The ruling of the infallible is free from doubts because in itself it is evidence and is not derived from another evidence. It is also based on fact/reality and not upon apparent suggestions. As for the jurist, his ruling is derived (from textual evidence) and is based upon external suggestions. Not only that, but it is susceptible to forgetfulness, being overwhelmed by conceit and pride, personal emotions, encompassing impact, environment and change in economic conditions and social standing. I have witnessed many instances wherein oppressive rulings were passed. The context does not allow for citing examples. However, I have known a jurist to be disinclined from the world and pious before assuming leadership, but after assuming it people started to talk about his leanings changing with his children and relatives-in-law.¹

This is a testification from a scholar against his own; a testification which says that whenever a jurist secures an opportunity of leadership his image as a pious and ascetic scholar soon changes. And these scholars, whom he describes with the above, according to Khomeini are meant to be the leaders of the Ummah.

Hence the opponents of the viewpoint of Khomeini still feel that the authority of the jurist is much more restricted than the authority of the Infallible Imām.² According to them it does not exceed what is narrated in their legacy, i.e. the authority of issuing fatwas, assuming judicial positions, overseeing endowments, the wealth of the absent Imām and the inheritance of those who have inheritors.³

Al-Mughniyah has, in order to support his viewpoint, drawn evidence from the statements of a number of their senior scholars and has thereafter violated the evidences advanced by Khomeini. He clarifies that they do not in any way refer to the comprehensive authority which he seeks to prove.

1 *Al-Khumaynī wa al-Dawlah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 59-60.

2 *Ibid.* p. 61.

3 *Ibid.* p. 60.

Whilst there is no need for us to delve in to the details of this debate, it is crucial to note that Khomeini declares that the classical position of his dogma, due to it averring that the authority of the jurist does not include authority in leadership, entails the annulment of the injunctions of Islam and is equivalent to believing that Dīn is abrogated. But on the other hand, Khomeini's proofs are not strong enough to support his viewpoint and thus the rulings he has passed regarding his dogma still remain true and that is that they are based upon principles contrary to Sharī'ah, reason and the nature of things.

Conversely, the opposite view returns the matter of leadership to the common people and does not consider it specific to the scholars of the Shī'ah. These scholars thus remain in the setting they were officially placed in, i.e. their restricted authority, till the Mahdī emerges and takes charge of both worldly and religious affairs. According to the secular language of these times this is referred to as separating religion from the state. The Shī'ī dogma thus oscillates between the extremism of Khomeini and the subtle call for separation between religion and the state. Any dogma which is based on falsehood will inevitably only emerge with such contradictions.

Likewise, both positions settle upon the invalidity of the Shī'ī dogma in its claim of emphatic appointments of the Imāms; because both of them do not restrict leadership to a specific individual except the Mahdī who is missing, absent and will never return due to him not existing at all.

The Constitution of the State of the Scholars

The Islamic republic of Iran had announced its constitution in a book which was published by the ministry of Islamic council. Its first edition was published in 1406 A.H and the contents of this constitution had previously been published in the Iranian magazine *al-Shahīd* in a special edition.¹

1 The publication of Mu'assasah al-Shahīd, Qum, 1979 A.H.

Hereunder I will present some of the contents of the constitution in order to see whether it really represents the constitution of a Muslim country, as they claim, or not.

The constitution establishes in its 'twelfth law' that:

الدين الرسمي لإيران هو الإسلام، والمذهب الجعفري الإثني عشري، وهذا الأصل يبقى إلى الأبد غير قابل للتغيير

The official religion of Iran is Islam and the Twelver Ja'farī dogma. This law will remain forever without any room for change.¹

The constitution also emphatically makes mention of the Twelver conception of Imāmah and links the idea of Khomeini regarding the representational authority of the jurist to the issue of Imāmah. It states:

إن ولاية الفقيه اعتمادا (يعني معتمدة) على استمرار ولاية الأمر والأمامة

The authority of the jurist is based upon the continuity of leadership and Imāmah.²

As you can see, they openly proclaim fanatical sectarianism but at the same time deem themselves the Islamic republic. Probably this statement of theirs suggests that their dogma does not fall part of Islam and thus it has to be mentioned separately alongside Islam as another religion. This is besides the fact that you will very frequently find them claiming that their dogma is not any different from the other Islamic denominations except in a few secondary issues. If that was really the case, then why do they unequivocally state the 'Ja'farī dogma' in their constitution?

Furthermore, what prevents this law from not changing forever? Do they have knowledge of the unseen or have they made an agreement with Allah? Why do

1 *Al-Dustūr* p. 20.

2 *Ibid.* 9.

they not open their eyes to the truth which is with the Ahl al-Sunnah and free themselves of their despised fanaticism? The name of the country should rather be the 'Ja'farī republic'; because an Islamic state is based upon Islam and not upon the dogma of a particular denomination. Also because when the ruler adopts a particular dogma or takes a particular stance he does so based upon the strength of the evidence and not due to fanaticism and inheritance from the predecessors. But the Shī'ah have, by way of this law, made it clear that they follow some of their scholars who opine that Twelver Shī'ism is a religion and not a denomination.¹

Part of the twelfth law suggests that the narrations of their Imāms are to replace the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. They thus exchange that which is superior for that which is inferior. It says:

يقوم نظام الجمهورية الإسلامية على أساس الاجتهاد المستمر من قبل الفقهاء جامعي الشرائط على
أساس الكتاب وسنة المعصومين سلام الله عليهم أجمعين

The administration of the Islamic republic is based upon the continuous application of Ijtihād by the scholars who possess all the requisites, upon the basis of the Qur'ān and the Sunnah of the Infallibles, may the peace of Allah be upon them all.²

In this article there is no acknowledgment of the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. This is for the simple reason that they do not believe in it, hence they only adopt the Sunnah of the infallibles whom they deem better than the Ambiyā' and the Messengers.

Can this constitution be considered an Islamic one when it does not acknowledge the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ?

As a result of this article they will draw from *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*, *Bihār al-Anwār* and other books with all the heresies and deviances which they contain. Because these are the books which have conveyed the Sunnah of the infallibles to them.

1 See the footnote no. 3 on p. 992 of this book.

2 *Al-Dustūr* p. 15, 16.

Furthermore, in some articles of the constitution you will find reference to ‘Persian slogans and nationalistic suggestions. The fifteenth law states:

اللغة والكتابة الرسمية والعامة هي الفارسية لشعب إيران، فيجب أن تكون الوثائق والمراسلات والمتون الرسمية والكتب الدراسية بهذه اللغة

The official and public spoken and written language for the Iranians is Persian. Hence it is compulsory that all documents, correspondence, official texts, and syllabi be in this language.

As you can see, this article is based upon Iranian nationalism. Islam has one language which is Arabic, not because it is the language of the Arabs, but because it is the language of the Qur’ān, the Sunnah, the state of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, the Ṣaḥābah, and their successors.

The sixteenth law states that their recourse will be to public opinion (not to Qur’ān and Sunnah):

يجب أن تدار شؤون البلاد في جمهورية إيران الإسلامية على رأي الأمة

It is compulsory that the matters of the lands in the Islamic republic of Iran be administered according to the opinion of the Ummah.¹

There is no doubt that the affairs of an Islamic state are administered in light of the Qur’ān and the Sunnah; the majority view is not the basis of governance in Islam, it is the basis of secular movements and organisations.

This principles is further elaborated in what appears in the fifty ninth law which states:

ممارسة السلطة التشريعية قد تتم أحيانا عن طريق الاستفتاء الشعبي العام، وذلك في القضايا الاقتصادية والسياسية والاجتماعية والثقافية الهامة. ويجري هذا الاستفتاء العام بناء على طلب أكثر من ثلثي مجموع أعضاء المجلس

1 *Al-Dustūr* p. 18.

Implementing the Sharīʿ jurisdiction at times will take place after inquiring the prevalent public opinion in economical, political, social, and important academic issues. This public inquiry will be based upon the demand of more than two thirds of the members of the parliament.¹

After having deprived themselves of the second legislative source, i.e. the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, it is no surprise that they resort to public opinion. Their scholar Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī, the author of *al-Ḥadāʾiq*, suggested to them that they should search for another procedure other than this one due to it no fulfilling what they want.²

This is just a glimpse of what appears in their constitution and is taken from the last edition which was published in 1406 A.H.³

1 Ibid. p. 46.

2 See his exact words and statements on p. 527 - 528 of this book.

3 It is crucial to note here that the translation of the constitution was published by the Lebanon newspaper *al-Safir* by Muḥammad Ṣādiq al-Ḥusaynī, but with differences between it and the last official publication of the constitution. Probably Taqiyyah played its role in the changes that were made in order to save the image of the dogma from being tarnished.

Hizb al-Tahrir, which is apparently an organization that sympathises with the Iranian revolution, supports it and considers it to be the desired Islamic rule, assumed the task of examining the articles of the constitution as was published by the al-Safir newspaper after having asked the Iranian embassy in Lebanon regarding the credibility of the published translation and receiving the response that it is precise and trustworthy. Following the study it became clear to them, as was published in a small booklet, that with the exception of the name the constitution has nothing to do with Islam. It also mentions that in the eighth section, which is regarding judicial authority, under articles no. 131, 132, 135 and 136 the contents suggest that the statutory civil law will be implemented in the courts (see: the text of the critique of the Iranian constitution which was published by Hizb al-Tahrir p. 48).

The organisation concludes that:

ليس دستورا إسلاميا، ولم يأخذ أحكامه من كتاب الله وسنة رسوله، ويتبين أن واضعه يتميز بعقلية غربية، ولا يتمتع بعقلية إسلامية

It is not an Islamic constitution and has not drawn its rulings from the Book of Allah and from the Sunnah of His Rasūl. It is clear that its formalisers have a western mentality and do not have an Islamic one. (See: Ibid. p. 52).

It is clear that it does not represent an Islamic state, rather it represents a Persian and Rāfiḍī Ja‘farī state; it does not draw its laws from the Qur’ān and the Sunnah and is instead associated with the narrations of al-Kulaynī and his likes, what they term as the Sunnah of the infallibles.

continued from page 1560

It also says:

إذا وضع هذا الدستور موضع التنفيذ فإنه لا يجعل الدولة دولة إسلامية

If this constitution is implemented it will not make the state and Islamic state.

It also says:

بأنه يجب أن يكون الدستور منبثقاً من العقيدة الإسلامية، ومأخوذة كل مواده من كتاب الله وسنة رسوله

It is crucial that the constitution stem from Islamic belief and that all its articles be drawn from the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Rasūl. (Ibid.)

This is the analyses of Hizb al-Tahrir which supports the Iranian government and is similar to the Shī‘ah in its ideology due to it suspending the implementation of some of the laws of Islam till the establishment of a Khilāfah (which is akin to the Shī‘ah suspending some of the injunctions of their dogma till the emergence of the absent Imam.) Had it not been for fear of elongating the discussion I would have presented the issues that they raised. The analyses coupled with a proposed Islamic constitution was sent to Khomeini. It seems as if the Shī‘ah benefitted from that and changed some of the articles which raise criticism against their constitution, as becomes clear by studying the last publication thereof. But despite the changes it is still not fully empty of misguidance, as was alluded to in the brief study. (To learn about Hizb al-Tahrir see: Salīm al-Hilālī and Ziyād al-Dabjī: *Kitāb al-Jamā‘āt al-Islāmiyyah fī Ḍaw’ al-Kitāb wa al-Sunnah* p. 137, onwards).

The Fifth Chapter

This chapter comprises of:

1. Their influence on the Muslim World
2. The Ruling Regarding them

Their influence on the Muslim world

The influence the Shī'ah have had upon the Muslim world in the various stages of history is a very vast and great topic; it includes several topics and various dimensions which necessitate multiple books and demand a lot of effort. Studying the historical events which took place in Iraq alone in the fourth and the fifth centuries when the Shī'ah had a very great impact is a very broad topic. So how much more strenuous would it be to discuss their impact on the entire Muslim world. Likewise, studying the ever-increasing Shī'ī movements in our times in various parts of the Muslim world and the results that they are producing requires field studies, mass networks, and multiple journeys.

All of this cannot possibly be put together in a book, let alone a chapter of a book which is primarily concerned with studying and analysing the principle doctrines of the Shī'ah.

It is for these reasons that I will suffice in this chapter upon allusions, cursory glances and concise words. Similarly I will suffice on portions of the topic rather than its whole, on one example of one town and one time, for example, rather than doing an in-depth and extensive study.

In order to not let the discussion lose focus I will mention the impact they have had in various spheres of life, i.e. are the following:

1. Doctrinal and ideological sphere

2. Political sphere
3. Social sphere
4. Economical sphere

This is a mere categorisation, otherwise the influences they have had in these spheres are interlinked. This is because the misfortune of innovation is such that it affects all spheres of life. A person who will study the history of this Ummah and the development of various innovative ideologies which emerged throughout time will sense the harms thereof in the entire Muslim empire. Listen to, for example what Ibn Taymiyyah has said regarding the fall of the Umayyad Empire:

إن دولة بني أمية كان انقراضها بسبب هذا الجعد المعطل

The fall of the Umayyad Empire was due to this Ja'd, the denier of the attributes of Allah¹, amongst other reasons.²

He further says:

وهذا الجعد إليه ينسب مروان بن محمد الجعدي آخر خلفاء بني أمية، وكان شؤمه عاد عليه حتى زالت الدولة، فإنه إذا ظهرت البدع التي تخالف دين الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم انتقم الله ممن خالف الرسل وانتصر لهم

Marwān ibn Muḥammad al-Ja'dī, the last of the rulers of the Banū Umayyah, is attributed to this Ja'd. His misfortune turned against him and caused the fall of the empire. When innovations which oppose the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ emerge Allah takes revenge from those who oppose the prophets and grants them victory.³

1 i.e. al-Ja'd ibn Dirham, the first person to deny the names and attributes of Allah ﷻ.

2 *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah* 13/182.

3 *Ibid.* 13/177.

This Islamic interpretation of historical events is in contrast to the approach of many historians who only analyse history from a purely materialistic perspective; it is that branch of knowledge which can only be understood by the people of imān.

The Doctrinal and Ideological Sphere

This is a very vast topic, but hereunder we will allude to some aspects thereof.

Bringing about Shirk in the Ummah of Muḥammad ﷺ

Their beliefs regarding Imāmah and the Imāms have had a clear influence in bringing about Shirk and other beliefs associated to it in the Muslim world. Some scholars thus assert that the Shī'ah were the first people to bring about Shirk and the worship of graves in the Ummah of Muḥammad ﷺ. Hence we find that the exaggerations of the Shī'ah regarding the Imāms transformed into exaggerations regarding their graves. And in order to support their polytheistic tendencies they invented narrations.

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

وأول من وضع هذه الأحاديث في السفر لزيارة المشاهد التي على القبور أهل البدع من الروافض ونحوهم الذين يعطلون المساجد ويعظمون المشاهد التي يشرك فيها ويكذب فيها ويتدع فيها دين لم ينزل الله به سلطاناً، فإن الكتاب والسنة إنما فيهما ذكر المساجد والمشاهد

The first people to forge narrations regarding travelling to visit holy sites situated at graves are the Shī'ah innovators and others like them; people who abandon the Masjids and consecrate the shrines where shirk is committed, lies are spoken, and such innovations are done for which Allah has revealed no evidence. In the Qur'ān there is only mention of Masjids, not of shrines and holy sites.¹

1 See: *al-Radd 'alā al-Akhnā'ī*: p. 47.

Today the holy sites of the Shī'ah and their shrines have become a locus of Shirk and the worship of others besides Allah. Many people who have visited the lands of the Shī'ah have attested to these polytheistic practices.¹ And sadly the ill-effects of these practices have slowly seeped into the lands of the Ahl al-Sunnah as well. The Shī'ah are the originators of this, a reality to which their books attest.

There is no need for us to enlist the names of these shrines and holy sites and sketch what takes place in them due to all of that being very popular.

Obstructing From the Dīn of Allah

The Shī'ī ideology, with all its discrepancies and deviances which have passed, was and still remains accompanied by the great propaganda of their scholars who seek in whichever way possible to increase their numbers.

This propaganda is based upon a great lie which the Shī'ah are masters at manipulating, and which they deploy to mislead their followers and the ignorant among the Muslims. This lie says that the irregularities of the Shī'ah are supported by the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah, which is why you will more often than not hear them saying that there are no differences between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah.

Indeed, we very often read this type of approach being advanced in their books where they draw evidence from the books of those whom they term the 'commonality'.²

1 See: p. 1417 onwards of this book.

2 There probably isn't a book from their later and contemporary books which does not deploy this approach. And the worst of them in its exaggerations is the book *Bulūgh al-Marām* which is fully based upon this approach and which is, owing to its blatant lies an indictment upon the Shī'ah for the rest of time. But despite that one of their scholars considers it to be a source of honour. (See: Muḥsin al-Āmilī: *al-Shī'ah* p. 134; also see the documents and texts attached to my book on the topic on *Taqrīb*, bridging the gap between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah).

Many people whose hearts Allah has misguided were misled by this great lie. Consequently they assumed that the religion of Islam does not entail anything else other than what these innovators propagate. They thereafter deemed that to be rationally flawed and thus left the fold of Islam and fell into the ditches of heresy and apostasy. An evident example of this is the Kharamiyyah,¹ the followers of Bābak al-Kharmī, and the Qarāmiṭah,² the followers of Abū Saʿīd al-Janābī, amongst others, who criticize the religion of Islam in its totality with their hands and tongues.³

There is no doubt that propagating innovations in the name of Islam is the greatest means of obstructing from the path of Allah; for how can an intelligent person ever accept the erroneous beliefs of *Ghaybah* (occultation), *Raj'ah*, the revilement of the Ṣaḥābah and the esoteric interpretative tradition?

1 The Kharamiyyah consists of two sects: the first sect existed before the emergence of the Islamic state. They are the followers of Mazdak al-Ībāḥī who called for partnership in all wealth and sexual rights. They caused a lot of mischief in the lands of Persia and were eventually destroyed by the Persian king Anūshirwān, known as the just king, who died before the advent of Nabī ﷺ.

The second sect emerged in the Islamic empire. They are the Bābikiyyah, the followers of Bābak al-Kharmī who first appeared on the outskirts of Azerbaijan and developed a large followership. He would deem all impermissible acts permissible. He defeated many of the Abbasid armies for a period of twenty years until eventually he was captured with his brother Ishāq and hanged in Surr man Ra'ā under the reign of Mu'taṣim in the year 223 A.H.

There is no doubt that the Kharamiyyah who appeared in the Muslim empire were an extension of the ancient Persian cult, i.e. the first Mazdakiyyah, and were responsible for the further deviation of the Shī'ah. Al-Nawbakhtī says that extremism started from them, for they were the first ones to claim that the Imāms are deities and that they are their messengers. They likewise believed in the transmigration of souls and rejected the afterlife. (See: al-Nawbakhtī: *Firaq al-Shī'ah* p. 36; Ibn al-Nadīm: *al-Fihrist* p. 342, 344; al-Isfarā'īnī: *al-Taḥṣīr fī al-Dīn* p. 79-80; al-Malaṭī: *al-Tanbīh wa al-Radd* p. 22; al-Ghazālī: *Faḍā'ih al-Bāṭiniyyah* p. 14, onwards).

2 One of the sects of the Ismā'īliyyah which we have already introduced on p. 124 (footnote 4). They are known as the Qarāmiṭah due to the founding figure Ḥamdān Qarmaṭ who was one of their propagators in the initial stages. (See: *Faḍā'ih al-Bāṭiniyyah* p. 12).

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/114.

Thus it is not far-fetched to assume in these times that the purpose for establishing the state of the scholars was to curb the hopes of the Muslims regarding the return of the Khilāfah and the unity of the Ummah. It was intended to guard against the spread of an Islamic awakening in the world. Because it is undisputable that a state which distorts Islam and gives a completely false impression regarding the aspirations of the Muslims can destroy the hopes of the people, the fervour of their aspirations and the flame of enthusiasm in the youth of the Ummah. The disbelieving colonialists thus pay a lot of attention to these innovative ideologies and follow their activities carefully via a group of researches, called ‘the Orientalists’, who are mostly advisors in ministries of foreign affairs. As a result the policies of most major countries are formulated after studying the works of the Orientalists regarding the history of sectarian divisions within Islam. The disbelieving colonialists have likewise not forgotten their history with us, as is attested to by the stances they have taken and by the comments some of their leaders have made, and as was exposed by Europeans like Muḥammad Asad who reverted to Islam in his book *al-Islām ‘alā Muftaraq al-Ṭuruq*.¹

Nonetheless, whether the establishment of the state of the scholars and the ever-increasing influence of the Shī‘ah in the Muslims world are intended by the

1 In his book he mentions, “The crusade wars had played the first and most important role in determining the stance of Europe regarding Islam.” (*al-Islām ‘alā Muftaraq al-Ṭuruq* p. 55). He further says that Europe benefitted from the Muslim world more than the Muslim world benefitted from it. But it did not acknowledge this good, not even by lessening its hatred against Islam. Instead the very opposite happened; enmity increased with the progress of time and subsequently became second-nature. As a result this hatred would instigate public conscience whenever the word Muslim was mentioned. It became so commonplace among them that it settled deep down in the heart of every male and female European. (See: *ibid.* 59-60).

He also says that these hateful sentiments remained alive despite the passage of all the eras of enlightenment and continuously increased despite the departure of the religious conscience which had engendered all this hatred. He then says that this is not strange given the fact that psychologist assert that at times even though a person loses all the religious tendencies he had assimilated in his childhood, but some special traits still defy all rationality. (See: *Ibid.* 60-61).

I say that the established laws of psychology are applicable to the religions of Europe, but not to the religion of Islam which is based upon sound human disposition.

disbelieving enemy or not, the effects in preventing from the Dīn of Allah and the emergence of heresy which seems persuasive to many Muslims are still the greatest problem. This will become clear from the following discussion.

The Emergence of Heterodoxy and Heresy

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions that the basis for the deviance of the Ismā'īliyyah, the Nuṣayriyyah and other heretics and hypocrites is that they believed the Rāfiḍah who promulgated regarding the interpretation of the Qur'ān and the Sunnah.¹ The 'Ubaydī Imams would base the validity of their claims upon the lies invented by the Rāfiḍah in order to win the support of their lay partisans. They would then take a person from criticising the Ṣaḥābah to criticising 'Alī and then to criticising divinity, as laid out for them by the master of the biggest message and the greatest human. And thus *Rafḍ* has been the greatest door which leads to disbelief and heresy.²

The Rāfiḍah are thus the door through which these heretics enter into all types of heresies regarding the names of Allah and the verses of His clear Book, as is acknowledged by the heads of the heretics like the Qarāmiṭah and other hypocrites.³

From the discussions that have passed in this book, it is clear that the narrations of the Twelvers and their traditions which they claim to have received from the Ahl al-Bayt are the ideal locus and fertile ground for the emergence of fanatical ideologies and heretical denominations. Because their legacy is a collection of the remnants of the irregular views and ideas of various Shī'ī sects, despite their disparate ideas, which disunited this Ummah and destroyed its matter. At first their views reached us through the books of heresiography, but thereafter we found that the narrations of the Twelvers support them and attest to them.⁴

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/3.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid. 1/3.

4 See p. 1297-1298 of this book.

And hence many sects like the Shaykhiyyah, the Kashfiyyah, and the Bābiyyah, which were infamous for their extremism and disbelief, emerged from the Twelver dogma. The author of *al-Muntaqā* thus says that Rafḍ houses the worst of denominations.¹ He then enlists many of the heretical sects which live under the umbrella of Rafḍ. Al-Ghazālī likewise says:

إن مذهب الباطنية ظاهره الرفض، وباطنه الكفر المحض

The dogma of the Bāṭiniyyah is *Rafḍ* externally and sheer disbelief internally.²

They are thus disbelievers who disguise themselves with the garb of Shī'ism. It seems as if they form the majority today, to the extent that Ibn Taymiyah mentions:

كثيرا من أئمة الرافضة وعامتهم زنادقة ملاحدة ليس لهم غرض في العلم ولا في الدين

Many of the scholars of the Rāfiḍah and their commonality are heretics who have no real interest in knowledge and Dīn.³

In conclusion, the setting of Shī'ism is fertile ground for people of all types of leanings and tendencies. In fact Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb has written that Shī'ism served as the catalyst for the spread of Communism and Baha'ism in Iran.⁴

Trying to Misguide the Muslims from the Sunnah of their Nabī

Amongst the influences they have had in the ideological sphere is that a group of them joined the ranks of the transmitters of ḥadīth and endeavoured to add such narrations to the ḥadīth legacy which serve Shī'ism. To the extent that a

1 *Al-Muntaqā* p. 77.

2 *Faḍā'iḥ al-Bāṭiniyyah* p. 37.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/70.

4 *Al-Khuṭūṭ al-'Arīḍah* p. 44-45.

fair amount of such narrations were found in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah and their ḥadīth collections. But the scholars of ḥadīth picked up the problem, clarified the truth, and exposed the sinister Shīʿī agenda. Al-Shaykh al-Suwaydī, whilst talking of this impact that the Shīʿah have made in this regard states:

إن بعض علمائهم اشتغلوا بعلم الحديث، وسمعوا من ثقات المحدثين وحفظوا أسانيد أهل السنة الصحيحة، وتحلوا في الظاهر بحلي التقوى والورع بحيث كانوا يعدون من محدثي أهل السنة فكانوا يروون الأحاديث صحاحا وحسانا، ثم أدرجوا في تلك الأحاديث موضوعات مطابقة لمذاهبهم، وقد ضل بذلك كثير من خواص أهل السنة، فضلا عن العوام. ولكن قيص الله بفضل أئمة الحديث فأدرکوا الموضوعات فنصوا على وضعها فتبين حالها حينئذ والحمد لله على ذلك. وقد أقرت طائفة منهم بالوضع بعد ما انكشف حالهم، وتلك الأحاديث الموضوعية إلى الآن موجودو في المعاجم والمصنفات وقد تمسك بها أكثر التفضيلية والمتشيعه

Some of their (Shīʿī) scholars engaged in the sciences of ḥadīth, heard narrations from reliable ḥadīth scholars and preserved the authentic chains of transmissions of the Ahl al-Sunnah. They outwardly disguised themselves with piety and asceticism and were thus considered to be from the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Hence they would narrate Ṣaḥīḥ and Ḥasan narrations and then added to them fabricated narrations which served their dogma. Many of the erudite of the Ahl al-Sunnah were deceived by this, let alone the laymen. But Allah ﷻ by his grace chose the scholars of ḥadīth who picked up the fabrications and stated that they are such. Hence their actual status became clear and all praise is for Allah. Furthermore, a group of their scholars who were exposed actually confessed that they would forge narrations. Those forged narrations are found till today in the narration lexicons and collections and have been used by the Tafḍīliyyah¹ and the Shīʿah.²

Also, al-Ālūsī mentions that Jābir al-Juʿfī would often deploy this strategy.³

1 The Mufaḍḍilah/ Tafḍīliyyah are the Zaydiyyah and the others who consider ʿAlī to be more virtuous than Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رضي الله عنه. (See: Ibn Taymiyah: *al-Tisʿīniyyah* p. 40).

2 Al-Suwaydī: *Naqḍ ʿAqāʾid al-Shīʿah* (manuscript without numbered pages) p. 25-26 (see them after by counting); al-Ālūsī: *al-Suyūf al-Mushriqah* (manuscript) p. 50; *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah* p. 32.

3 *Al-Suyūf al-Mushriqah* p. 50.

Likewise Ibn al-Qayyim has mentioned that Ḥāfiẓ Abū Ya'lā has said the following in his book *al-Irshād*:

وضعت الرافضة من فضائل علي رضي الله عنه وأهل البيت نحو ثلاثمائة ألف حديث

The Rāfiḍah have fabricated almost three hundred thousand narrations regarding the merits of 'Alī عليه السلام

Ibn al-Qayyim comments by saying:

ولا نستبعد هذا فإنك لو تتبع ما عندهم من ذلك لوجدت الأمر كما قال

We do not deem this far-fetched. For if you have to analyse whatever they have in this regard you will find the matter according to what he has said.¹

Overtly Entering the Dogma of the Ahl al-Sunnah in order to Misguide

Some of the effects which the Shī'ī plotting has left in the Muslim world are those which have come about as a result of some of their scholars overtly entering the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah and assuming the titles 'Ḥanafī' and 'Shāfi'ī' in order to misguide the people. After assuming these identities they wrote books which bolstered the Shī'ī dogma.²

1 *Al-Manār al-Munīf* p. 116.

2 They have adopted different strategies in this regard which have all been exposed by the author of *al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnay 'Ashariyyah*. At times they write a book regarding the merits of the four Khulafā', and when they come to the discussion regarding the merits of 'Alī they include in it that which supports the ideas of Rafḍ like that of emphatic appointment and revilement of the Ṣaḥābah (see: *al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnay 'Ashariyyah* [manuscript] p. 46). At times they write a book regarding the juristic rulings of one of the schools and will propagate that book in circles which do not adopt that particular school. They include therein some very grave issues like practicing upon reason and rejecting ḥadīth and approbating obscene acts. The author of *al-Tuḥfah* has alluded in this regard to a book, *al-Mukhtaṣar*, which they forged against Imām Mālik wherein they falsely attributed to him that it is permissible to commit sodomy with slaves. (See: *Ibid.* p. 45). And at times they write books wherein they claim that they were following the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah but when its falsity became clear to them they forsook it (for example the book *Limādhā Ikhtartu Madhhab al-Shī'ah* which they attribute to a person with the name Mar'ī al-Anṭākī). And they have other strategies as well, the details of which require a dedicated book.

Likewise some of their scholars, who overtly subscribed to the Ahl al-Sunnah, contrived ideas similar to those which exist in the Shī'ī dogma and promulgated them in Muslims circles. Shaykh Muḥammad Abū Zuhrah was of the opinion that Najm al-Dīn al-Ṭūfī (d. 716 A.H.) intended to promulgate the Shī'ī dogma deploying this strategy in his discussion regarding *Maṣlaḥah*, public interest, taking precedence over the textual evidence of Shar'ah. Because this is exactly what the Shī'ī dogma asserts: according to the Shī'ah it is permissible for the Imām to specify or abrogate any textual evidence after the demise of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. Hence al-Ṭūfī transported this very idea but without mentioning the word 'Imām' and replaced it with the word *Maṣlaḥah*. Thereafter, Abū Zuhrah opines that al-Ṭūfī by virtue of him undermining the textual evidence and promulgating the idea of specification and abrogation in cases of *Maṣāliḥ Mursalah*, unspecified public interest, has in fact intended to undermine the sacredness which the Muslims accord to the dictates of the legislator, i.e. Allah and his Rasūl Allah ﷺ.¹

Moving on, the Shī'ah have at times, taking advantage of the similarity which exists between the names of their scholars and the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah, included worthless ideological content in order to mislead the seekers of the truth; they search in the names of Sunnī scholars for credible names and whoever they find having a similar name to any of their scholars they attribute the narration or the view of that particular Shī'ī to him.

One such example is Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī, the famous Sunnī Imām and the author of a work in history and a work in Qur'ānic exegesis. The Shī'ī scholar Muḥammad ibn Jarīr ibn Rustum al-Ṭabarī² shares the same name as him. Added to that, they both were from Baghdād, they lived in the same era and passed

1 Ibn Ḥanbal: p. 326. Abū Zuhrah has mentioned the biography of al-Ṭūfī and has established that he was a Shī'ī (Ibid. 324-325). In classing al-Ṭūfī a Shī'ī he has relied upon the *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābilah* of Abū Ya'lā.

2 He has written a few books on Shī'ism as well. For example: *al-Mustarshid fī al-Imāmah* and *Nūr al-Mu'jizāt fī Manāqib al-A'imma al-Ithnay 'Ashar*. (See: *Jāmi' al-Ruwāt* 2/82-83; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/177; *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* 2/91; also see: *Lisān al-Mizān* 5/103).

away in the same year, the year 310 A.H. The Shī'ah exploited this similarity and attributed to Imām Ibn Jarīr some things, like the book *al-Mustarshid fī al-Imāmah*¹ (the book of the Shī'ī Ibn Jarīr),² which supports their dogma. And till today they attribute to him some narrations which bolster their dogma.³

This plot of the Shī'ah engendered problems for Ibn Jarīr during his lifetime. Ibn Kathīr mentions that some lay people accused him of being a Shī'ī whilst others accused him of being a heretic.⁴ Likewise a book regarding *Ghadīr Khum* consisting of two volumes was attributed to him, and so was the view that it is permissible to wipe the feet in Wuḍū'.⁵

And it seems as if some of the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah learnt of this plot of the Shī'ah. Hence Ibn Kathīr mentions:

ومن العلماء من يزعم أن ابن جرير اثنان أحدهما شيعي وإليه ينسب ذلك وينزهون أبا جعفر من هذه الصفات

Some among the scholars claim that there were two Ibn Jarīrs and that one of them was a Shī'ī. And they attributed all of this to him and exonerate Abū Ja'far from having such traits.⁶

This view which Ibn Kathīr has attributed to some scholars is the truth which became clear to us after studying the books of transmitter biographies and the legacy of each of the two. And where is the earth from the heavens, for the difference between the legacies of both men is obvious and cannot be compared. The creed of Imām ibn Jarīr has no similarity whatsoever with the creed of the Shī'ah; he was indeed one of the great scholars of Islam in having knowledge regarding the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and practicing upon them.

1 Ibn al-Nadīm: *al-Fihrist*; p. 335.

2 Ṭabaqāt A'lām al-Shī'ah fī al-Mī'ah al-Rābi'ah p. 252; Ibn Shar Āshūb: *Ma'ālim al-'Ulamā'* p. 106.

3 Al-Amīnī al-Najafī: *al-Ghadīr* 1/214-216.

4 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/146.

5 Ibid.

6 Ibid.

There is likewise another Shīʿī by the name Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭabarī.¹ He is different from the first one even though Professor Fuʿād Sazkīn has considered them to be one.² The *al-Madīnah al-Munawwarah* newspaper published a forged story of the latter which was titled '*Iqd al-Zahrā*'. It would never have made its way to the publishing house had the Shīʿah not exploited the similarity of names.³

And like Ibn Jarīr there are many others.⁴ But the context does not allow for a detailed discussion, for this topic requires a dedicated study.

1 Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad ibn Abī al-Qāsim ibn 'Alī al-Ṭabarī, a Shīʿī scholar from the sixth century. (See: *Ṭabaqāt A'lām al-Shīʿah fī al-Qarn al-Sādis* p. 242-278.

2 He has thus mistakenly attributed the book *Bashārah al-Muṣṭafā* to the first (Ibn Rustum) whereas it is the work of the second (Ibn Abī al-Qāsim). (See: *Tārīkh al-Turāth* 2/260).

3 *Al-Madīnah* newspaper: edition no. 4721, published on Tuesday the 24th of Rajab 1399 A.H. The story was chosen by Muḥammad Sālim Salīm from the book *Bashārah al-Muṣṭafā*. Whereas this book *Bashārah al-Muṣṭafā* is steeped in fanatical ideas, one among them being interpreting *al-Jibt wa al-Ṭāghūt* to mean Abū Bakr and 'Umar (see: p. 237). Likewise it is stated therein that whoever doubts in giving 'Alī precedence, considering him most virtuous, deeming obedience to him being compulsory and acknowledging his Wilāyah will be deemed a disbeliever even if he displays Islam (see: p. 51).

4 Like Ibn Qutaybah, for there are two men with this name: one is the extremist Shīʿī 'Abd Allah ibn Qutaybah and the other is the reliable Sunnī scholar 'Abd Allah ibn Muslim ibn Qutaybah. The latter authored a book and named it *al-Ma'ārif*, and in order to mislead the people the former wrote a book and also named it *al-Ma'ārif* (see: *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnay 'Ashariyyah* p. 32; *Mukhtaṣar al-Ṣawāqī*, manuscript, p. 51; *Naqd 'Aqā'id al-Shīʿah*, manuscript, p. 25).

Research scholars were perplexed by the book *al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah* which is attributed to the Sunnī Ibn Qutaybah due to it containing many falsities. A scholar even tried to identify the actual author of the book but to no avail. He says, "I tried a lot to identify the actual author of the book *al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah* but I did not come across anything." ('Abd Allah al-'Usaylān: *al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah* p. 20). Some opined that the author was one of the adherents of school of Imām Mālik (ibid. 20), despite the Shīʿī influence in the book being quite clear; it clearly reviles the Ṣaḥābah and claims that 'Alī refused to pledge allegiance to Abū Bakr due to considering himself more rightful of leadership. Professor 'Abd Allah al-'Usaylān has cited these examples and their like which appear in the aforementioned book (ibid. p.17-18-19). But what slipped his attention and the attention of many is the fabrications of the Shīʿah and that there were two Ibn Qutaybahs, and that the book *al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah* is from the works of the Shīʿī one. Despite its importance I have not come across who has alluded to this matter.

Spreading Shī'ism in the Muslim World

From amongst the evidences which suggest that the Shī'ah strive in proselytising their beliefs amongst the Muslims is their ancient narrations which state that only one city embraced their beliefs, Kūfah.

Abū 'Abd Allah says:

إن الله عرض ولايتنا على أهل الأمصار فلم يقبلها إلا أهل الكوفة

Allah ﷺ presented our Wilāyah to the people of the cities but only the people of Kūfah accepted it.¹

Hence in the initial stages Shī'ism did not gain acceptance but in Kūfah due to it being far from knowledge and its people.² Their acceptance was due to the influence of 'Abd Allah ibn Saba' who had played a very active role there initially, to the extent that he only departed from it after winning followers who would operate according to his plans.³

The great scholar of Kūfah, Abū Ishāq al-Sabī'ī (d. 127 A.H), noticed the difference which had transpired in his city. He had left Kūfah when its people were adhering to the Sunnah and when no one was doubting the merit of Abū Bakr and 'Umar رضي الله عنهما and deeming them the most virtuous, but when he returned he found that the reprehensible views of Rafḍ had appeared.⁴

Subsequent to that the virus of Shī'ism permeated the entire Muslim world. So much so that some researchers mention that today in every hundred Muslims ten are Shī'ah.⁵

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 60/209, 100/259 (with reference to *Baṣā'ir al-Darajāt*).

2 See the introduction of this book p. 15

3 Sulaymān al-'Awdah: 'Abd Allah ibn Saba' p. 49.

4 See p. 73 - 74 of this book.

5 Rūm Lāndo: *al-Islām wa al-'Arab* p. 95.

The proselytisers of Shī'ism in this era form movements which actively roam around the Muslim world in order to spread Shī'ism following a strategized plan. They utilise the funds provided by the academic seminaries which receive their donations from the perspiration and toiling of those gullible followers whose minds have been clouded and hearts overwhelmed by that beautiful and deceptive claim of the 'love for the Ahl al-Bayt, a claim in which the Shī'ah clergy have no share save the name and the claim. Hence they take possession of great amounts of wealth under the pretext of the right of *Khums* for the Imām. The slogans and catchwords which these clandestine movements raise are very similar to those of the Freemasons, for at times they call for bridging the gap between the various Islamic schools of thought¹ and at times introduce themselves as the 'the council of the Ahl al-Bayt.'²

Similarly, after the establishment of the state of the scholars in Iran all the Iranian embassies have transitioned into centres of the propagation of Shī'ism. They have likewise taken advantage of the Islamic centres and the Masjids, especially on Fridays, in order to spread Shī'ism.

To get an idea of this, the *al-Mujtama'* magazine published a document regarding the activities of the Shī'ah in Europe. Therein it says:

تحولت السفارات والقنصليات الإيرانية في أوروبا إلى مراكز لنشر عقيدتهم في أوساط المسلمين (إلا الكفار) المقيمين في أوروبا، وتؤكد ذلك عشرات بل مئات وآلاف الكتيبات والمنشورات الخاصة بالفكر الشيعي، وتوزيع هذه الكتيبات على المسلمين الأوروبيين في أماكن تجمعهم وخاصة عند أبواب المساجد، أو في البريد، أو من خلال وسائل أخرى... وحتى المراكز الثقافية والمكتبات تبدو وكأنها أقيمت من أجل نشر دعوة التشيع الإيراني بين الأقلية المسلمة في أوروبا، فبا لإضافة إلى ما تحتويه هذه المكتبات من كتب ونشرات حول الثورة الإيرانية ومنهجها العقائدي... نجد أن القائمين على هذه المكتبات ينظمون دروسا وندوات تتعلق في معظمها بالقضية العقدية

The Iranian embassies and consulates in Europe have turned into centres for spreading their beliefs amidst the Muslims who are residing in Europe.

1 *Fikrah al-Taqrīb* p. 511.

2 *Ibid.* 514.

This is supported by the tens, rather the hundreds and thousands of booklets and publications which are dedicated to the Shī'ī ideology and which are distributed amidst the European Muslims in places which unite them, especially at the doors of Masjids, via posts and other mediums. To the extent that even academic centres and libraries seem as if they have been established in order to spread Iranian Shī'ism amidst the Muslim minority of Europe. Hence aside from the books and literature which these libraries contain regarding the Iranian revolution and its specific approach to belief, we find that these libraries organise lessons and clubs which are specific to the issues of belief.

The magazine then goes on to list some of the libraries in Europe which organize lessons and lectures pertaining to belief regarding the Iranian revolution on the Thursdays and Saturdays of every week, and which distribute magazines, booklets and voice recordings. The Muslims are invited to attend such gatherings as a tool to spread the Shī'ī ideology as espoused by the Iranians.

Likewise, the Iranian centres have started to encourage youth who have been beguiled by them and whom they use as their agents to start going to Masjids and establish relationships with those who come to offer their Ṣalāh, especially on Fridays when many Muslims come together in order to offer the Jumu'ah Ṣalāh. The magazine states that at times these encounters lead to clashes and problems in the Masjids and thereafter presents a few examples. It also avers that these Iranian activities will in the long run leave its negative effects upon the Muslims.¹

Furthermore, the activities of the Shī'ah are dynamic and multi-faceted and do not take heed of any principles like is the case of the Ahl al-Sunnah. This is because the Shī'ah consider Taqiyyah to be nine tenths of their Dīn. In fact one of their contemporary scholars has acknowledged without realising that Taqiyyah according to them is the objective which justifies the means.² I.e. in reaching

1 *Al-Mujtama'*, edition no. 760, published on 15th of Rajab 1406 A.H.

2 Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah: *al-Shī'ah fī al-Mīzān* p. 49.

the objective which they aim for, it is ok to adopt any means; in other words, it is just like the approach of Machiavellianism¹ which is adopted by those who have no Dīn in order to reach their goals. In Islam the objective does not make impermissible means permissible.

Hence we find that the mediums which the Shī'ah deploy to propagate their dogma take on various forms of deception and misrepresentation, a result of which is that many Muslim tribes and individuals have lost their faith. They have actually at times propelled some seniors of various tribes to embrace Shī'ism by enticing them with *Mut'ah* marriages.²

Al-Ḥaydarī published a very appalling report in '*Unwān al-Majd* wherein he enlists the amount of tribes which have become Shī'ah due to the efforts of the Shī'ah. He mentions:

وأما العشائر العظام في العراق الذين ترفضوا من قريب فكثيرون منهم ربيعة... ترفضوا منذ سبعين سنة، وتميم وهي عشيرة عظيمة ترفضوا في نواحي العراق منذ ستين سنة بسبب تردد شياطين الرافضة إليهم، والخزاعل ترفضوا منذ أكثر من مائة وخمسين سنة وهي عشيرة عظيمة من بني خزاعة فحرفت وسميت خزاعل... وعشيرة زبيد وهي كثيرة القبائل وقد ترفضت منذ ستين سنة بتردد الرافضة إليهم وعدم العلماء عندهم. ومن العشائر المترفضة بنو عمير وهم بطن من تميم، والخزرج وهم بطن من بني مزينة من الأزد،

1 Machiavellianism is a method in dealings which is characterized by deceit, trickery, breaching of trust and egoism. It is based on the principle 'the end justifies the means'. It is attributed to the Italian thinker Niccolo Machiavelli (born in 1469 A.H. and died in 1527 A.H.) the founder of this idea which he recorded in his book *The Prince* and presented to one of the Kings of Europe in the Medieval ages. (See: Aḥmad 'Aṭiyyah: *al-Qāmūs al-Siyāsī* p. 1105-1106).

2 In the year 1326 A.H. Shaykh Muḥammad Kāmil al-Rāfi'ī revealed in a letter he sent to his friend Rashīd al-Riḍā from Baghdād, which was published by the *al-Manār* magazine in the 16th vol. that whilst on his tour of these lands he discovered that the scholars of the Shī'ah invite the Bedouins to Shī'ism by making *Mut'ah* marriages permissible for them due to them always having the passion to amorously enjoy with many women.

At first the magazine published the letter without revealing the name of the writer. But subsequently in the 29th vol. Shaykh al-Riḍā revealed the name and said that they did not publish the name of the writer at that time so that he does not encounter any harassment from the Ḥamīdī government which was infamous for its oppressive nature. (See: *al-Manār*, vol. 29; also see: vol. 2 p. 687).

وشمر طوكه وهي كثيرة والدوار والدفاعة. ومن المترفضة عشائر العمارة آل محمد وهي لكثرتها لا تحصى وترفضوا من قريب، وعشيرة بني لام وهي كثيرة العدد وعشائر الديوانية وهم خمس عشائر: آل أفرع، وعفج، والجبور وجليحة، والأقرع ست عشيرة قبيلة وكل قبيلة كثيرة العدد، وآل بدير ثلاث عشيرة قبيلة وهي أيضا كثيرة العدد، وعفج ثمانى قبائل كثيرة العدد، وجليحة أربع قبائل كثيرة العدد، والجبور كذلك. ومن عشائر العراق العظيمة المترفضة منذ مائة سنة فأقل عشيرة كعب وهي عشيرة عظيمة ذات بطون كثيرة

As for the big families which converted to Shī'ism in Iraq in recent times, they are many. Amongst them are: Rabī'ah which converted to Shī'ism seventy years ago, Tamīm, a big family situated at the borders of Iraq, converted to Shī'ism sixty years ago owing to the frequent visits of the devils of the Shī'ah to them, al-Khuzā'al which became Shī'ah more than a hundred and fifty years ago –it is a big family which belongs to the Banū Khuzā'ah tribe but later its name was distorted and it was named Khuzā'al, and Zabīd which consists of many tribes and converted to Shī'ism sixty years ago owing to the frequent visits of the Shī'ah and the absence of scholars. Likewise from the families that converted to Shī'ism are Banū 'Umayr, a sub-tribe of Tamīm, Khazraj, a sub-tribe of Banū Mazī'iqiyyā of Azd, Shamrī'ukah which is a very large tribe and Dafāfi'ah. In addition, the families of 'Umārah Āl Muḥammad who are so many in number that they cannot be enumerated, the family of Banū Lām which is huge in number, the tribe of al-Dīwāniyyah which constitutes of five families: the families of Āl Aqra', Āl Budayr, 'Afj, al-Jabūr and Julayḥah (tribes which are likewise large in number); Aqra' consists of sixteen tribes, each tribe having many numbers, Āl Budayr consists of thirteen tribes which are also huge in number, 'Afj consists of eight huge tribes, Julayḥah consists of four huge tribes and likewise al-Jabūr. The family of Ka'b and which is a very big tribe and has many sub-tribes also converted to Shī'ism a hundred years ago.¹

Al-Ḥaydarī in this way goes on to enumerate all the tribes of the Ahl al-Sunnah which converted to Shī'ism due to the negligence of the Ahl al-Sunnah, and due to these people being deceived by the words of the Shī'ah who would tell them 'let's come together and help one another', 'let's unite and bridge the divide', 'the differences between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah are no different than the

1 'Unwān al-Majd fī Bayān Aḥwāl Baghdād wa al-Baṣrah wa Najd p. 112-118.

differences which exist within the various schools of the Ahl al-Sunnah', etc. The Ahl al-Sunnah thus owing to their inactiveness prepared the land for the scholars of the Shī'ah to propagate their dogma, or else had the truth been explained no one would have been deceived by Shī'ism.

To this day they still continue to spread their dogma on all levels.

They likewise pay special attention to fostering relations with the heads of some states who they discern would accept their dogma. Like in the case of Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī who established relations with Khudā Bandah.¹ This relationship had great effects which are known to all. Likewise in contemporary times they done the same with the head of Libya who eventually displayed inclinations toward Shī'ism in his beliefs and leadership.

Similarly, they have bought over some writers whose hearts are void of īmān and deployed them to write literature in order to call to Shī'ism and write introductions to the books of the Shī'ah.²

1 Khudā in Persian means Allah and Bandah means servant, i.e. the servant of Allah. Khudā Bandah was the eighth king from the kings of the Ilkhanate dynasty and was the sixth descendant of the progeny of Genghis Khan. His real name was al-Jātiyū, the son of Arghūn, the son of Abghā, the son Hulagu. Ibn Kathīr mentions, 'He remained upon the ways of the Ahl al-Sunnah for a year and thereafter converted to Shī'ism and established its symbols in his lands.' (*Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 14/77). This was because he had just recently accepted Islam and had no knowledge regarding the Islamic beliefs and the history thereof. Subsequently he met Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī who made the Shī'ī dogma appealing to him as a result of which he and his entire family and tribe converted to Shī'ism. Ibn Muṭahhar had written many books like *Nahj al-Ḥaqq* and *Minhāj al-Karāmah* in order to invite the following sultan to embrace the Shī'ī dogma.

Ibn Kathīr mentions, "During his times great problems and tragic calamities occurred. But eventually Allah ﷻ gave reprieve to the land and the people by eliminating him and gave him death at the age of thirty six." After his demise his son repented in the year 710 A.H from Shī'ism and reverted to the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah with the help of the Ahl al-Sunnah. He distanced the Shī'ah and thus al-Ḥillī had to flee to Ḥillah and likewise all their scholars. (See: *al-Tuhfah al-Ithnay 'Ashariyyah* p. 43 of the manuscript; *Ta'līqāt Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb 'alā al-Muntaqā* p. 18-19).

2 You will notice this in some of the books which they send to the Muslim world in order to propagate Shī'ism. They get people like those mentioned above to write a few approbatory words. An example of this in the books *Aṣl al-Shī'ah* and *Aqā'id al-Imāmiyyah*, etc.

They also choose bright male and female students from the Muslims world and grant them free education in Qum in order to brainwash them and nurture them according to Shī'ism so that they may return to their lands as proselytizers of Shī'ism.

The supreme scholar of al-Azhar says:

الأبناء التي تصلني من كافة أنحاء العالم الإسلامي تدل على أن هذه الحركة الإيرانية الخمينية الآن تنشر العنف، وتحاول أن تستقطب بوجه خاص في كثير من البلدان الإسلامية بالإغراءات المتعددة المالية والدراسية في إيران وغير ذلك من السبل بقصد إحداث الفركة باستقطاب هؤلاء الشباب، ودفعهم إلى إثارة الخلافات في بلادهم وبين شعوبهم... إن حركة بهذا العنوان وبهذا الواقع تكون مثار اضطراب في الأمة الإسلامية... وأعتقد أنه على الشعوب الإسلامية أن تكون حذرة فيما تساق إليه بواسطة الخمينية أو غيرها، فهي حركة من الحركات الموفدة لتفتيت الأمة الإسلامية وبث الصراع والخلاف فيما بينها.

The reports which reach us from all parts of the Muslim world suggest that this Iranian Khumainian movement is currently spreading violence. It is trying to attract the youngsters in many of the Muslims lands by enticing them with monetary and educational incentives to study in Iran, amongst other means which it deploys to create discord, attract these youth, and propel them to give rise to contentions in their countries and people. A movement of this sort and which holds such a reality will surely cause turbulence in the Muslim Ummah. I thus believe that the Muslims should be very wary of what is being brought to them through the medium of the Khumainiyyah and other movements. It is indeed a movement from those movements which are sent in order to disunite the Ummah and spread discord and dissent between it.¹

The Emergence of Shī' Leanings in the Writings of some Writers who are Affiliates of the Ahl al-Sunnah

In the writings of some thinkers who affiliate themselves to the Ahl al-Sunnah signs of leanings toward the Shī' ideology have emerged. The writings of these

1 *Akhbār al-Yawm*, edition no. 2160, published on Saturday the 11th of Rajab 1406 A.H.

individuals have come to the fore as effected by the doubts and misconceptions raised by the Shī'ah regarding the Ṣaḥābah and the issue of Imāmah. Any person who will read what some thinkers and writers have written regarding the history of the initial stages of Islam or the book *Nash'ah al-Fikr al-Falsafī fī al-Islām*, or the book *al-Imāmah wa al-Khilāfah* will realise the extent to which the Shī'ī ploy has succeeded in distorting facts before these people.

I, however, do not doubt that in this class of people there is a group which has been enticed with the glamour of wealth and propelled by the deceptive goods of this world in order to say what they have said and to write what they have written. The Shī'ah pay money to famous figures so that they may write that which is in accordance with the Shī'ī dogma. In the past, one of the pious predecessors is reported to have said, "If I wanted them to fill my house with money for lying regarding 'Alī they would do so. But by Allah I will never lie regarding him."¹

What would the situation today then be like when they have wealth in abundance and honesty has decreased in the hearts of many who have become deceived by the world and by the devil regarding the Dīn of Allah?²

If you want an example of this Shī'ī influence then here is one. Professor 'Alī Sāmī, the author of *Shuhadā' al-Islām fī 'Aṣr al-Nubuwwah* writes the book *Nash'ah al-Fikr al-Falsafī fī al-Islām* and includes in it that which cools the eyes of the Shī'ah; he excommunicates some of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. For example he says the following regarding Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه:

1 This was al-Sha'bī. See: 'Abd Allah ibn Aḥmad: *al-Sunnah* 2/549.

2 The Arabic proverb says: 'every utensil gives off what it contains'. Likewise another one says: 'She accused me of her flaw and disappeared'. The head of the Ja'farī Judiciary in Beirut Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah accused professor Muḥammad Ḥusayn Haykal of omitting a particular text from his book *Ḥayāt Muḥammad* in lieu of five hundred Egyptian pounds. This accusation was levelled at him because he omitted a particular text from his book which he came to learn was weak and thus removed it in the second edition; this Shī'ī accused him of this based on the practice of his people and their norms. Consider and muse. (See: Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah: *al-Shī'ah fī al-Mizān* p. 18: footnote.

ومهما قيل في معاوية، ومهما حاول علماء المذهب السلفي المتأخر وبعض أهل السنة من وضعه في نسق صحابة رسول الله، فإن الرجل لم يؤمن أبدا بالإسلام، ولقد كان يطلق نفثاته على الإسلام كثيرا ولكنه لم يستطع أكثر من هذا

Irrespective of whatever has been said regarding Mu'āwiyah and despite the efforts of the scholars of the later Salafī School and some of the Ahl al-Sunnah to include him amongst the Companions of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, the man did not embrace Islam at all. He would very often release his blows against Islam but did not manage to anything more than that.¹

See how great his accusation is! This type of accusations was only previously known to be made by the Shī'ah and their like. How can a Muslim ever blurt such a statement regarding a Companion who strove with Rasūl Allah ﷺ and witnessed the Battle of Ḥunayn with him,² who was entrusted with the task of documenting revelation and took charge of the affairs of the Muslims for forty years, at first as a governor and thereafter as a ruler, establishing for them the symbols of Islam?³

He further goes on to accuse the Ahl al-Sunnah by claiming that the view that Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was a Ṣaḥābī is the view of only some of the Ahl al-Sunnah, but the majority hold the same view as him. This is a lie and a fabrication, similar to what the Shī'ah hold regarding the permissibility of lying. The īmān of Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is established by diffuse transmission and the consensus of the people of knowledge.⁴

Similarly he says the following regarding his father Abū Sufyān ibn Ḥarḥ:

ولقد كان أبو سفيان زنديقا أي ممن يؤمنون بالمجوسية الفارسية

Abū Sufyān was a heretic who would believe in the Persian fire worship.⁵

1 Nash'ah al-Fikr al-Falsafī 2/19.

2 Majmū' Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām 4/458

3 Ibid. 4/472.

4 Ibid. 4/477.

5 Nash'ah al-Fikr al-Falsafī 2/31.

Whereas Nabī ﷺ used him as his governor; when Nabī ﷺ passed away he was the governor of Najrān. How could he be a heretic when Nabī ﷺ entrusted him with the welfare of the Muslims in aspects of knowledge and practice?¹

He also agrees with the Shī'ah when he says that only a few amongst the Ṣaḥābah deemed 'Alī more deserving of rulership and that the matter was usurped from him. He says:

وقد أحس قلة من خلص الصحابة أن الأمر نزع من علي للمرة الثالثة وأنه إذا كان الأمر قد سلب منه أولا لكي يعطى للصاحب الأول، ثم أخذ منه ثانيا لكي يعطى للصاحب الثاني فقد أخذ منه ثالثا لكي يعطى لشيخ متهاو متهالك لا يحسن الأمر ولا يقيم العدل يترك الأمر لبقايا قريش الضالة

A small group of devout Companions realised that the matter was snatched from 'Alī for the third time. And that where the matter was snatched from him the first time so that it be granted to the first person and thereafter it was snatched from him the second time so that it be granted to the second person, the third time it was snatched from him so that it be given to a weak and languorous man who was not good at administration and establishing justice and who left the matter to be taken care of by the remaining misguided individuals of the Quraysh.²

He is referring to the rightly guided Khalīfah Dhū al-Nūrayn 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ upon whose Khilāfah the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ unanimously agreed. It is as though he is undermining all of them due this accusation.

He also says the following regarding the Rāfiḍah who call themselves the Twelvers and who believe and acknowledge all that has passed, and criticism of whom is excessively found in the statements of the scholars of Islam:

إن الأفكار الفلسفية للشيعه الإثني عشرية هي في مجموعها إسلامية بحتة

1 Majmū' Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām 4/454, 35/66.

2 Nash'ah al-Fikr al-Falsafi 1/228.

The Philosophical thought of the Twelver Shī'ah is as a whole purely Islamic.¹

Look at how greatly and appallingly he has parted from the mainstream.²

He likewise says, as if a Shī'ī, that:

بأن شيعة علي الذين أحبه عن يقين وإيمان وساروا في ركب الإمام وهم على إيمان مطلق بأنه الأثر الباقي
لحقيقة الإسلام الكبرى، وبجانب هذا العثمانية والأموية الذين كرهوا الإسلام أشد الكراهية وامتألت
صدورهم بالحدق الدفين نحو رسول الله وآله وأصحابه

The Partisans of 'Alī who loved him with conviction and faith and joined his caravan with complete īmān are the remains of the greatest reality of Islam. Opposite to them are the 'Uthmānīs and the Umawīs who hated Islam very much and whose hearts were filled with malice for Rasūl Allah ﷺ his household and his Ṣaḥābah.³

I will suffice upon this one example because this is also a topic which requires an in-depth study and analyses.

Distorting the History of the Muslims

The Shī'ah have literature in history which is aimed at distorting the history of the Muslim Ummah, as is clear from the narrations of al-Kalbī,⁴ Abū Mikhnaf,⁵

1 Ibid. 1/13.

2 Doctor Muḥammad Rashād Sālim رحمه الله informed me that due to having a suspicious relationship with a disbelieving wife, a trip to Europe due to the coercion of 'Abd al-Nāṣir and a bad financial standing conditions befell him which had an impact upon his thought and ideology. Something of this sort is not too much to conceive regarding someone who disparages the Companions of Nabī ﷺ.

3 Ibid. 1/228-229.

4 Muḥammad ibn al-Sā'ib al-Kalbī. Ibn Ḥibbān says that al-Kalbī was a Saba'ī who would believe that 'Alī did not die and that he will return to this world. He died in 146 A.H. See: *Mizān al-I'tidāl* 3/558; Ibn Abī Ḥātim: *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* 7/270-271; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 9/178.

5 Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā ibn Sa'īd ibn Mikhnaf al-Azdī (Abū Mikhnaf). From Kūfah. Ibn 'Adī said regarding him that he is a extremist Shī'ī who is the compiler of their reports. He died in 157 A.H. He wrote many books, some being: *al-Riddah*, *al-Jamal*, *Ṣiffīn*, etc. For his biography see: *Mizān al-I'tidāl* 3/253; al-'Uqaylī: *al-A'lām li al-Zarkalī* 6/110-111.

and Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim¹; which are found in the *Tārīkh* of al-Ṭabarī.² But al-Ṭabarī cites all these narrations with their chains of transmission so that the people of knowledge come to learn their status.

As is also clear from the writings of al-Masʿūdī in *Murūj al-Dhahab* and al-Yaʿqūbī in his *Tārīkh*. Professor Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb has averred in his annotations on *al-ʿAwāṣim wa al-Qawāṣim* that the compilation of history started after the fall of the Umayyad Empire and that the Bāṭiniyyah and the various denominations which had adopted Shīʿism played a very big role in obliterating the symbols of good and darkening the bright pages of history.³

This deceitful ploy becomes evidently clear to a person who studies the *al-ʿAwāṣim min al-Qawāṣim* of Ibn al-ʿArabī with the outstanding explanatory annotations of Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb.

The scholars of the Shīʿah have darkened thousands of pages in reviling the best century humanity has ever known and they have spent their time and their efforts in distorting and misrepresenting the history of the Muslims.

1 Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim ibn Sayyār al-Minqarī al-Kūfī. Al-Dhahabī has said that he was a extremist Shīʿī whom the scholars of ḥadīth have forsaken. He died in 212 A.H. amongst the books he has written: *Waqʿah Ṣiffīn* (printed), *al-Jamal*, *Maqṭal al-Ḥusayn*. See: *Mizān al-Iʿtidāl* 4/253; al-ʿUqaylī: *al-Ḍuʿafāʾ al-Kabīr* 4/30; Ibn Abī Ḥātim: *al-Jarḥ wa al-Taʿdīl* 8/468; *Lisān al-Mizān* 6/157; *al-Aʿlām* 8/350.

2 For the narrations of al-Kalbī in *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* see: 1/335, 2/237, 238, 272, 370, 465, 3/168, 274, 286, 425, 4/108, 368, 5/449, 6/103, 349, 364.

As for the narrations of Abū Mikhnaḥ, they are many and can be found in more than three hundred places. The Orientalist A. Bel states in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* 1/399 that Abū Mikhnaḥ wrote thirty two books on history regarding various issues which transpired in the first century of Islam. Al-Ṭabarī has preserved most of them by recording them in his *Tārīkh*, but the books which have reached us and have been attributed to him are from the forgeries of the later scholars. (See: *al-Aʿlām* 6/111: footnote).

The narrations of Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim can be found in 4/458, 465, 485, 487. (See: the detailed tables of contents prepared by Abū al-Faḍl Ibrāhīm in the tenth volume of the *Tārīkh*).

3 *Al-ʿAwāṣim min al-Qawāṣim* (annotations) p. 177.

The copious ‘Shī’ content, which you will come across in the books of history written by the Shī scholars, or in the transmission of which they played a role, in their books of ḥadīth like *al-Kāfi*, *al-Biḥār*, and in other books which their scholars wrote in the bygone eras like *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq* and in recent times like *Kitāb al-Ghadīr*, is what the enemies of Islam like the Orientalists and others have used as their reference material.

In following them, the spiritually ill generation of occidentalists which saw in the west its role model, assimilated everything that they wrote and made that their primary source, thereby adopting their views and spreading misconceptions and doubts in the lands of the Muslims. All of this left behind very grave consequences and changes in the thought of the Muslims and their academics. And it was Shīism that was the root of all of this evil.

Studying the views of the Orientalist and identifying the connection between them and the Shīah is a very crucial topic which requires a rigorous study. It is not possible for us to delve into it in this study due to constraints, but it is sufficient for us to allude to it and raise awareness regarding it.

The non-believing enemy started to benefit from the misconceptions and distortions of the Shīah regarding Islam and the Muslims at a time which is not very recent. In the era of Ibn Ḥazm (d. 456 A.H) already the Christians were exploiting the erroneous belief of the Shīah regarding the Book of Allah as evidence to their advantage in debating with the Muslims. Ibn Ḥazm responded to all their issues with resolution and revealed that the views of this particular cult are not worth consideration due to them not being Muslims.¹

In Literature

Arabic literature and poetry have likewise not been safe from the influence of Shīism; Shīism has left its evil effects upon them as well. The poets among

¹ See: p. 1647 of this book.

the Shī'ah have always exploited the 'atrocities' suffered by the Ahl al-Bayt in provoking the sentiments of people and invigorating their feelings, thereby putting them into action against the Ummah and its Dīn

In some of the literature that has reached us you will discern some leanings toward the beliefs of the Shī'ah. You will also notice the exaggerations which are infused into depicting the difficulties that befell the Ahl al-Bayt in order to spread Shī'ism and revile the Ṣahābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.

The spear headers of Shī'ism have exerted themselves in propagating fables and fairy tales regarding their Imāms in the form of provocative narratives, talks and poetry characterised by exaggeration.

As a result, the beliefs of the lay community became affected, even their belief in the Oneness of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, owing to which they deified others besides Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.

Hence Muḥammad Sayyid Kīlānī mentions:

فترى أن التشيع قد أخرج لونا من الأدب كان سببا في هبوط بالمسلمين إلى هوة سحيقة من التأخر والإنحطاط. وقد أفلح الوهابيون في القضاء على كثير من هذه الخرافات داخل بلادهم، أما في الأقطار الإسلامية الأخرى فالحال باقية كما هي عليه حتى بين طبقة المتعلمين

You will notice that the Shī'ah have produced a specific type of literature which consequently played a role in the downfall of the Muslims into the deep ditches of regression and backwardness. The Wahhābis were successful in eliminating much of these fables from their lands. As for the other Muslim lands, the condition is still as it was previously, even amidst the learning class.¹

1 Muḥammad Sayyid Kīlānī: *Athar al-Tashayyū' fī al-Adab al-'Arabī* (published by Dār al-Kutub al-'Arabī in Egypt) p. 43

In order to gauge the extent of their influence it will suffice to study their famous and credible poem, the Azriyyah poem.¹

They have used literature to attack the Ummah by disparaging its leaders and distorting the image of the Muslim society. Hence you will find the overstating of the existence of mockery, deviance, and misguidance in the society. In fact at times even depicting the entire community and its leader in a very disparaging way, like how they did with the Khalīfah Hārūn al-Rashīd and his stories with Abū Nawās. Whereas he was the Khalīfah who would go out in Jihād one year and would go for Ḥajj the following year. In literature they also found breathing space for themselves, i.e. freedom from Taqiyyah due to an aura of sentiments and imaginations. Hence they would pour out their hatred and dislike for the Khalīfah and the Ummah in narratives, poetry, parables, or sermons. To understand all of this it would suffice to refer to the book al-Aghānī of the Shīṭī Abū al-Faraj al-Aṣfahānī.

1 This poem was written by their scholar Muḥammad Kāẓim al-Azrī who died in 1211 A.H. (*al-Dharī'ah* 17/135). Professor Maḥmūd al-Mallāḥ critiqued this poem in a book which he named *al-Raziyyah fī al-Qaṣīdah al-Azriyyah*. Therein he mentions that their scholar Muḥammad Riḍā al-Muẓaffar wrote an introduction to the poem wherein he mentioned that their scholar the author al-Jawāhir (Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn Bāqir al-Najafī {d. 1266 A.H.}) His book *al-Jawāhir* is the commentary of *Sharā'i' al-Islām*, one of their credible books in Fiqh. See: Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyah: introduction to the book *Sharā'i' al-Islām* would desire that the Azriyyah poem be included in his works in place of his book *Jawāhir al-Kalām*. He then goes on to present some stanzas of the poem, stanzas brimming with Shirk and blatant disbelief, for example the following stanza which is regarding 'Alī:

وهو الآية المحيطة في الكون ففني عين كل شيء تراها

He is the sign which is all encompassing in the world, and thus in the essence of everything you will see it.

And the stanza:

كل ما في القضاء من كائنات أنت مولى بقائها وفناها

All that is decreed to happen, you are the guardian of its existence and ruination.

See: *al-Raziyyah fī al-Qaṣīdah al-Azriyyah* p. 33-35.

The Political Sphere

The Shī'ah, as their canonical sources emphasise, do not acknowledge the legitimacy of any empire or state in the Muslim world. They consider the Khalīfah of the Muslim world a *ṭāghūt*, devil/idol, and his dynasty void of any Sharī status. They only consider the Khilāfah of Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī and Hasan (عليه السلام) to be exceptions to the rule. It has previously been mentioned that their narrations state that any flag which is raised before the emergence of the Mahdī, the raiser thereof is a *ṭāghūt*.¹

Therefore, the enemy waiting for every opportunity to destroy the Muslim Ummah found its long lost need in the Shī'ah whom they utilised in accomplishing many of their goals; this is due to the existence of the aforementioned belief whose natural result is the absence of loyalty and obedience, and overt enmity and dislike for the Muslim ruler and subjects.

The Shī'ī denominations have thus always been a submissive tool in the hands of the enemy and an obedient mount which they have used to reach their objectives.

Furthermore, the doctrine of Taqiyyah made it easy for the Shī'ah to strategize and give shape to conspiracies. Much like a Masonic secretive movement disguised in the garb of Islam and the garment of love and obedience to the Imām of the Muslims, but covertly determined to conspire against the Ummah. Hence they say:

خالطوهم بالبرانية وظاهروهم بالجوانية إذا كانت الأمر صبيانية

Intermingle with them outwardly and oppose them inwardly when leadership ends up in the hands of children.²

1 See p. 1002 of this book.

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 2/220.

The Shī'ah have thus been deployed in various eras of history by heretics who subjugated them to fulfil their goals and execute their plans. Likewise, many of the leaders of the heretics joined the ranks of Shī'ism so that it be possible for them to exploit the simpletons. Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

إن أكثر معتنقى التشيع لا يعتقدون دين الإسلام. إنما يتظاهرون بالتشيع لقلّة عقل الشيعة وجهلهم ليتوسلوا بهم إلى أغراضهم

Majority of those who embrace Shī'ism do not really believe in the religion of Islam. They merely display Shī'ī tendencies due to lack of intellect in the Shī'ah and their ignorance by virtue of which they can easily exploit them in order to reach their motives.¹

The incidents and events of history attest to the fact that Shī'ism has been the ideal setting for any person who intended to destroy Islam and its people.

Many groups amongst the Persians whose empire the Muslims destroyed within seven years found in Shī'ism to be their long awaited opportunity. So did the Jews seize the opportunity of achieving their goals under the pretext of Shī'ism.

Till today the enemies of Islam and those who conspire against it disguise themselves with Shī'ism. During the conflict which broke out between various parties which all subscribe to the Twelver dogma, confessions had come to the fore from the people themselves. Hence one of the Shī'ah researchers has reported that the Russian ambassador in Iran Kanyāz Dakūrī would attend the lessons of their scholar al-Rashatī,² the founder of the Kashfiyyah School which is a sub-sect of the Twelvers, which would be held in Karbalā' under the disguise of an invented name 'Shaykh ʿĪsā al-Lankarānī'. This was disclosed by the *al-Sharq* magazine which was published by the Russian Soviet ministry of foreign affairs in the year 1924-1925.³

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 2/48.

2 See his biography in *al-A'lām* of al-Zarkalī 6/67; *Aḥsan al-Wadī'ah* 1/72.

3 *Āl Ṭu'mah: Madīnah al-Husayn* p. 53.

Likewise the retired English general Ja‘far ‘Alī Khān (a name which he adopted to disguise himself apparently) would also disguise himself as a Shī‘ī and attend the lessons of Kāẓim al-Rashatī.¹

The researcher states that this phenomenon is due to the fact that the enemies foreknew that the residents of these two lands, Iraq and Iran, are from the lovers of the Ahl al-Bayt and thus targeted them from the theological perspective.² Hence, via the medium of the Kashfī ideology they popularised extreme ideas regarding the Imāms and made them the partners of Allah in his attributes of creation and sustenance. They also fed them the idea that there is no punishment for any sin however small or big it might be.³

He thereafter says:

وهكذا وجد الاستعمار في هذه الديار العربية المسلمة أرضاً خصبة لغرس شجرة العقيدة الحنظلية

In this way did colonialism find fertile grounds for planting the colocynth plant of belief in these Arabian Muslim countries.⁴

I would add that prior to this the Safawid propensity of extremism played a very pivotal role in implanting the seeds of extremism through the teachings and writings of some of their evil scholars like al-Majlisī, al-Jazā‘irī, al-Kāshānī and others.

Nonetheless, this enemy who disguises himself in the garb of Shī‘ism and infiltrates the ranks of the Shī‘ah at times obtains a very lofty position. Why wouldn’t this be so when their belief regarding the consensus of the Ummah accords the views of an unknown group and an unknown person precedence over all other views due to the possibility that he be the Mahdī?⁵

1 Ibid. p. 53.

2 Ibid. Same page.

3 Ibid. p. 54.

4 See: *Madīnah al-Ḥusayn* p. 54.

5 And then he does not lose out on any of his passions which he would indulge in before overtly entering into Shī‘ism. His lustful desires are thus gratified by way of Mut‘ah marriages, the lending of sexual rights and anal sex with women, each of which is an institution in their dogma. *continued...*

Having said this, a person who analyses the events of history and its battles will realise that the problems caused by the claimants of Shī'ism have been the most grave of all problems which the Muslim dynasties have encountered. This is because they are overtly with the Muslims but are covertly their greatest enemy. To the extent that Ibn Taymiyyah has said:

إن أصل كل فتنه وبليّة هم الشيعة، ومن انصوى إليهم، وكثير من السيوف التي سلت في الإسلام، إنما كان من جهتهم وبهم تسترت الزنادقة

The root of every problem and difficulty is the Shī'ah and those who have sided with them. And many of the swords which were brandished in Islam were from the Shī'ah. The heretics disguised themselves in them.¹

Furthermore, due to the fact that they consider the Muslims to be more steeped in disbelief than the Jews and the Christians, they form coalitions with the enemies of Dīn whose enmity is known to everyone, i.e. the Jews, the Christians and the Polytheists, and oppose the friends of Allah who are the most pious of people and the leaders of the pious.²

Ibn Taymiyyah says:

وقد رأينا ورأى المسلمون أنه إذا ابتلى المسلمون بعدو كافر كانوا معه على المسلمين

Continued from page 1593

As for Shar'ī obligations, they are lightened by virtue of combining Ṣalāhs and at times even completely forgiven by virtue of love for the Ahl al-Bayt. Jihād is discarded till the emergence of the Mahdī. Thus there is no fear of loss of life. If he reaches the rank of a Āyah or Ḥujjah or a Marjī' then lustrous gold is thrown at his feet under the pretext of Khums. Likewise he reaches the level of being the Bāb and consecration and reverence under the pretext of the 'representation of the Imām'. So of what harm would it be to him to infiltrate their ranks and covertly operate for his people amidst the Shī'ah camouflaging himself by wearing black clothing. At times he might just claim to belong to the progeny of the Ahl al-Bayt in order to gain popularity.

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/243.

2 See p. 969-970 of this book.

We have seen and the Muslims have seen that whenever the Muslims are tested with a non-Muslim foe they are always with them against the Muslims.¹

By way of example, the people witnessed that when Hulagu, the king of the Mongol disbelievers, entered Sham in the year 658 A.H. the Shī'ah were at the forefront of those helping in establishing his dominion, executing his orders and destroying the Muslim dynasty. Likewise the people all know, the learned and the lay, of the bloodbath that had occurred after the arrival of Hulagu in Iraq, the magnanimity of which is only known to Allah. The minister of the Khalīfah Ibn al-ʿAlqamī and the Shī'ah were his secret advisors who helped in many open and clandestine ways detailing all of which will prolong the discussion.²

Before that, the Shī'ah helped the grandfather of Hulagu, Genghis Khan, against the Muslims.

Similarly, the Muslims noticed on the shores of Shām that when the Muslims and the Christians were at war their inclination was toward the Christians whom they assisted as much as possible. They would dislike that the cities of the Christians be conquered as much as they hated that ʿAkkā and other places be conquered and would give preference to their victory against the Muslims. To the extent that when the Muslims were defeated at the hands of Ghāzān³ in the year five hundred and ninety nine and consequently the Muslim army evacuated Shām they went about wreaking havoc and causing destruction by murdering, usurping wealth, raising the flag of the cross, giving preference to Christians over the Muslims, and taking captives, wealth and weaponry from the Muslims to the Christians in Cyprus. This and other events were witnessed by the Muslims and has diffusely reached those were not present.⁴

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/110.

2 Ibid. 3/38.

3 He was the brother of Khudā Bandah, from the grand children of Genghis Khan, the king of the Mongols. As for the details of the incident to which Ibn Taymiyyah is alluding refer to *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 14/6.

4 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/244; also see p. 38-39 of the same volume; also see: 4/110-111; *al-Muntaqā* p. 329-332 and the annotations of Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb on the topic.

They were also one of the main reasons why the Christians gained control of Bayt al-Maqdis in the past till the Muslims succeeded in reclaiming it from them.¹

The discussion on this topic is very vast and the books of history are replete with reports which sketch these unpleasant realities.

Nonetheless, if this was the influence of the Shī'ah who stayed within the Muslim empire, then the influence of independent Shī'ī dynasties was much more severe. Hence Ibn Taymiyyah mentions that the dynasty of the Buwayhids² comprised of different types of reprehensible schools: some among them were heretics, some were Qarāmiṭah, some with Philosophical leanings, others Mu'tazilah and yet others who were Shī'ah.

The Muslims suffered such weakness during their reign as was not known even when Christians secured control over places which were situated at the borders of the Muslim world. The Qarāmiṭah rapidly spread in Egypt, the west and the east and many events transpired.³

He also says the following regarding the rule of Khudā Bandah:⁴

وانظر ما حصل لهم في دولة السلطان خدا بنده الذي صنف له هذا الكتاب كيف ظهر فيهم من الشر الذي
لو دام وقوي أبطلوا به عامة شرائع الإسلام لكن يريدون أن يطفئوا نور الله بأفواههم ويأبى الله إلا أن يتم
نوره ولو كره الكافرون

See what they obtained during the dynasty of Khudā Bandah for who he wrote this book.⁵ The evil which came to fore was such that if it continued

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/110.

2 Emerged in Iraq and a portion of Iran in the year 334 and ended in the year 437 A.H. The Twelvers consider their dynasty to be from their dynasties. (See: *al-Shī'ah fī al-Tārīkh* p. 98; *al-Shī'ah fī al-Mīzān* p. 138-148).

3 *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 4/22.

4 See footnote no. 1 on p. 1581 of this book.

5 i.e. *Minhāj al-Karāmah* which Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī wrote and to which Ibn Taymiyyah wrote a response by the name *Minhāj al-Sunnah*.

and intensified then most of the symbols of Islam would have been obliterated. But they want to extinguish the light of Allah and Allah refuses except to complete his light even though the disbelievers dislike that.¹

Up to the present day the Shī'ī influence is reaching the lands of the Muslims from the state of the scholars in Iran, from their organisations in Lebanon², and from their movements in the Arabian Gulf, etc.

Iḥsān Ilāhī Ṣāhīb mentions that the Independence of eastern Pakistan from Pakistan was due to a Shī'ī conspiracy. He says:

وها هي باكستان الشرقية ذهبت ضحية بخيانة أحد أبناء قزلباش الشيعة يحيى خان في أيدي الهندوس

Here we have Eastern Pakistan which was lost to the Hindus due to the treachery of one of Qazalbāsh Shī'ah Yaḥyā Khān.³

The leading scholar of the Shī'ah in Pakistan opposed the implementation of the Islāmīc Sharī'ah⁴ due to it minimising their freedom of carrying out their passions which they practice in the name of *Mut'ah*, and due to them being implicated for their crimes which they would otherwise very conveniently commit averring that with the love of 'Alī no sin is harmful.

Nonetheless, these are just a few allusions to some very great issues the explanation and analyses whereof require volumes of books.

But hereunder I will choose two examples and deliberate over them so that we may take lessons:

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/244.

2 See: *al-Amal wa al-Mukhayyamāt al-Filasṭīniyyah* of Muḥammad al-Gharīb.

3 *Al-Shī'ah wa al-Sunnah* p. 11.

4 See: *Mazālim al-Shī'ah* p. 9-10. The leader of the Shī'ah, Muftī Ja'far Ḥusayn, said in a press conference that the Shī'ah disagree with the execution of the capital punishments because they will be executed according to the school of the Ahl al-Sunnah. (See: *al-Anbā' al-Kuwaitiyyah* 1/5/1979 A.C.)

The first is linked to the influence of the Shī'ah within the Muslim empire, and that is the incident of Ibn al-'Alqamī and his conspiracy in destroying the Muslim empire.

The second is linked to the influence of the Shī'ī dynasty upon the Muslims, i.e. and that is the Safawid dynasty.

The Conspiracy of Ibn al-'Alqamī the Shī'ī

The short of the story is that Ibn al-'Alqamī was the minister of the Abbasid khalīfah al-Musta'ṣim who, like his father and forefathers, followed the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah. He was lenient and not very vigilant. Exploiting these traits the Shī'ī minister was plotting to finally destroy the Khilāfah, annihilate the Ahl al-Sunnah and establish a dynasty based on the dogma of the Shī'ah. He thus took advantage of his position and the heedlessness of the Khalīfah to execute his plots against the Khilāfah. The threads of his conspiracy can be summed up in three stages:

The First Stage: Weakening the army and harassing the people. He done so by trying to deprive the army from their stipends and the poor people from their allowances: Ibn Kathīr mentions:

وكان الوزير ابن العلقمي يجتهد في صرف الجيوش، وإسقاط اسمهم من الديوان. فكانت العساكر في آخر أيام المستنصر قريبا من مائة ألف مقاتل... فلم يزل في تقليلهم إلى أن لم يبق سوى عشرة آلاف.

And the minister Ibn al-'Alqamī would strive to divert the army and remove their names from the records. Hence the armies towards the latter part of the reign of al-Mustaṣhir consisted of a hundred thousand soldiers, but he consistently worked at decreasing them till only ten thousand remained.¹

The Second Stage: Correspondence with the Tatars. Ibn Kathīr mentions:

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 13/202.

ثم كاتب التار، وأطعمهم في أخذ البلاد وسهل عليهم ذلك، وحكى لهم حقيقة الحال وكشف لهم ضعف الرجال

He then wrote to the Tatars and instilled in them greed to take the lands. He related the reality of the matter to them and revealed to them the weakness of the men.¹

The Third Stage: Stopping the people from combatting the Tatars and discouraging the Khalīfah. He stopped the people from fighting them² and made the Khalīfah assume that the king of the Tatars is only coming to enter into a truce with him. He suggested to the Khalīfah that he go out to him and agree with him on half of the taxes of Iraq being for him and half for the Khalīfah. Hence the Khalīfah went out to him in an entourage of seven hundred people who were all judges, jurists, leaders and luminaries. Through this ploy the massacre of the Khalīfah and the prominent members and leaders of the community came to being without any effort from the Tatars. The Shī'ah and the hypocrites had told Hulagu not to enter into a truce with the Khalīfah; Ibn al-ʿAlqamī told him that the truce if enacted will only last for a year or two after which things will return to how they were. They embellished the killing of the Khalīfah for him and it is said that the ones who told him to kill the Khalīfah were Ibn al-ʿAlqamī and Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī.³

Thereafter they headed to the city and killed all the men, women, children and old people they got hold of. With the exception of the Jews and the Christians, whoever sought refuge from them and whoever sought refuge in the house of Ibn al-ʿAlqamī, no one else was spared.⁴

1 Ibid. 13/202.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/38.

3 Naṣīr was with Hulagu who had sought his company to serve him after he conquered the forts of al-Alamut and took them from the Ismāʿīliyyah. (*Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 13/201).

4 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 13/201-202.

They had eventually killed approximately eleven million some odd people, or more or less. Islam had not seen a massacre of this magnitude in its history. They killed the Hāshimīs and took their Abbasid and non-Abbasid wives as captives. The question is: Can a person who makes the enemy march upon the family of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and all the Muslims, kill them, and imprison them be a partisan and a lover of the Ahl al-Bayt?¹

They also killed the orators, Imams of the Masjids, and the bearers of the Qur'ān. The Masjids became empty and Ṣalāh in congregation and Jumu'ah Ṣalāh were discarded for months in Baghdad.²

The motive of Ibn al-'Alqamī was to annihilate the Sunnah completely and replace it with the innovation of Shī'ism. He also wanted to deactivate the Masjids and seminaries and build a huge centre for the Shī'ah through which they could propagate their dogma. But Allah ﷻ had not allowed him to do so and deprived him of all his bounties and seized him a few months after this grave incident. He was subsequently followed by his children.³

Deliberate over this grave incident and appalling disloyalty. Also consider the good nature of some of the Ahl al-Sunnah, which has resulted in heedlessness, who want to bridge the divide with their staunchest of enemies. Also take note of the immense hatred which the Shī'ah bear for the Ahl al-Sunnah. This Shī'ī was the minister of al-Musta'ṣim for fourteen years. His ministership had earned him such reverence and status as not enjoyed by any other minister. But these privileges did not help in any way to eliminate from his heart the hatred and malice which he bore for the Ahl al-Sunnah. What is even more interesting is that the later Shī'ah considered these crimes of Ibn al-'Alqamī and Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī against the Muslims to be from their great feats and achievements. Hence Khomeini, in commending the accomplishments of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī mentions:

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/38.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 13/203.

3 *Ibid.* 13/202-203.

ويشعر الناس بالخسارة بفقدان الخواجة نصير الدين الطوسي وأضرابه ممن قدم خدمات جليلة للإسلام

People, i.e. the Shī'ah, feel that they have suffered a loss upon the demise of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī and his likes who offered great services for Islam.¹

The services intended here are what al-Khūwansārī, who lived before him, has enlisted in the biography of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī;

ومن جملة أمره المشهور المعروف المنقول حكاية استيزاره للسلطان المحتشم... هلاكو خان... ومجيئه في موكب السلطان المؤيد مع كمال الاستعداد إلى دار السلام بغداد وإصلاح العباد... بإبادة ملك بني العباس، وإيقاع القتل العام من أبتاع أولئك الطغام إلى أن سال دماؤهم الأقدار كأمثال الأنهار، فانهار بها في ماء دجلة ومنها إلى جهنم دار البوار

And from his famous, well-known, and reported matters is his cooperation with the demure king Hulagu Khan and his arrival with the entourage of the aided king who came to Dār al-Salām Baghdād with full preparation and reformed the bondsmen. They destroyed the kingdom of the Banū 'Abbās carried out a mass murder of the followers of those lowly people till consequently their impure blood flowed like rivers and poured into the Tigris river and from there to Jahannam the house of ruination.²

Hence they consider his conspiring to massacre the Muslims from his greatest feats, for massacre according to them is the way to guide the bondsmen and reform the lands. They consider the Muslims who were martyred in this massacre to be destined to the fire, which entails that Hulagu the polytheist and his army are from the people of Jannah due to them soothing the grudges of the Shī'ah against the Muslims. Look at the extent of their hatred which makes the massacre of the Muslims their greatest hope in life and which makes the disbelievers closer to them than the community of the Muslims.

1 *Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* p. 128.

2 *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* 6/300-301; also see the praises for Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī in the book: al-Nūrī al-Ṭabarsī: *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* 3/483 and al-Qummī: *al-Kunā wa al-Aḳāb* 1/356.

This is the story of Ibn al-‘Alqamī which most of the books of history have recorded¹ and which is not only acknowledged by the Shī‘ah but commended as well. But despite this, one contemporary Shī‘ī has tried to reject this incident and question its authenticity. His evidence is that those who have reported it were not alive when it happened. And when he comes to the mention of those who lived during that era and recorded it, like Shihāb al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Ismā‘īl (d. 665 A.H.) he responds by saying that although he lived during that era, but he was from Damascus and thus was not a first-hand witness of the incident.²

This is an attempt to reject that which is very well established according to the historians, similar to their attempt to deny the existence of Ibn Sabā.

After running a search through the books of history I came across a very important testimony of a great historian who possessed three attributes: 1) the Shī‘ah consider him to be from their transmitters, 2) he is from Baghdad and 3) he passed away in 673 A.H.

Hence he was a Shī‘ī who lived during the era of the incident in question and was from Baghdad. This is the Imām and jurist ‘Alī Ibn Anjab al-Sā‘ī. He has attested to the crime of Ibn al-‘Alqamī. He says:

... وفي أيامه (يعني المستعصم) استولت التتار على بغداد وقتلوا الخليفة، وبه انتقضت الدولة العباسية من أرض العراق، وسببه أن وزير الخليفة مؤيد الدين بن العلقمي كان رافضياً...

In his days (i.e. Mustā‘ṣim) the Tartars took over Baghdad and killed the Khalīfah. This brought an end to the Abbasid dynasty in the lands of Iraq. And the reason for this was that the minister of the Khalīfah Mu‘ayyid al-Dīn ibn al-‘Alqamī was a Shī‘ī... He continues to narrate the incident.³

1 Also refer to: Ibn Shākir al-Kutbī: *Fawāt al-Wafayāt* 2/312; al-Dhahabī: *al-‘Ibar* 5/225; al-Subkī: *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyyah* 8/262-263, etc.

2 See: Muḥammad al-Shaikh al-Sā‘īdī: *Mu‘ayyid al-Dīn ibn al-‘Alqamī wa Asrār Suqūṭ al-Dawlah al-‘Abbāsiyyah*. The University of Baghdad helped in publishing the book.

3 *Mukhtaṣar Akhbār al-Khulafā’* p. 136-137.

Muḥsin al-Amīn has considered Ibn al-Sāʿī from the narrators of the Shīʿah. He says:

علي ابن أنجب البغدادي المعروف بابن الساعي له أخبار الخلفاء ت ٦٧٤ هـ

‘Alī ibn Anjab al-Baghdādī, famously known as Ibn al-Sāʿī. For him is the book *Akhbār al-Khulafāʾ*. He died in 674 A.H.

A sufficient indication for the link between the Shīʿah and the atrocities of the Muslims and their desire that many others of the same kind transpire is the satisfaction which has come forth from the later scholars of the Shīʿah like al-Khūwansārī, Khomeini and others.

The Safawid Dynasty¹

Under the Safawid rule, which was founded by Shāh Ismāʿīl al-Ṣafawī, Twelver Shīʿism was forcibly imposed upon the Iranians and it was deemed the official dogma of Iran. Ismāʿīl was a harsh person who was thirsty for blood to an unconceivable extent.² He would popularise regarding himself that he is infallible and that there is no barrier between him and the Mahdī and that he does not take any step but in accordance with the demands of the Imāms of the Twelvers.³

He carried his sword and struck the Ahl al-Sunnah with it. He would test the people by asking them to curse the first three Khulafāʾ. Subsequently, whoever would hear the cursing would be obligated to say ‘*Besh Bād Kam Bād*’ which in the Azerbaijani language means that the listener is pleased with the swearing and is requesting for more. If someone would refuse to say this particular phrase he would immediately be slayed. The Shāh had ordered that the cursing take place upon the streets, in the markets, and upon the pulpits and threatened to

1 The Safawid Dynasty lasted from the year 905 A.H. to 1148 A.H. (See: *al-Shīʿah fī al-Mīzān* p. 182).

2 ‘Alī al-Wardī: *Lamaḥāt Ijtīmāʿīyah min Tārīkh al-ʿIrāq* p. 56.

3 Kāmil Muṣṭafā al-Shaybī: *al-Fikr al-Shīʿī wa al-Nazaʿāt al-Ṣūfiyyah ḥattā Maṭlaʾ al-Qarn al-Thānī ʿAshar al-Hijrī* p. 413.

kill those who opposed.¹ Whenever he would conquer a city he would force the people to embrace Shī'ism by the might of his sword.

It is reported that when he conquered Tabriz and initially wanted to forcibly convert the people to Shī'ism, some of the scholars suggested that he give the matter some time due to two thirds of the city being the Ahl al-Sunnah who will not bear the cursing of the three Khulafā' upon the pulpits. But he answered by saying:

إذا وجدت من الناس كلمة اعتراض شهرت سيفي بعون الله فلا أبقى منهم أحد حيا

If I find even a word of opposition from the people I will unsheathe my sword with the help of Allah and will thereafter not leave anyone of them alive.²

On the other hand, in addition to his methodology of threatening and terrifying the people, he deployed the issue of the massacre of Ḥusayn as a means to provoke sentiments. Hence he ordered that gatherings be organised to commemorate the martyrdom of Ḥusayn in the ways we see them being commemorated today.³ And added to that he also included what is known as *Majālis al-Ta'ziyah* (gatherings of condolences). Today these gatherings are known as 'al-Shabīh', and in them plays of the martyrdom of Ḥusayn are done. This had a very great impact upon the people and thus some have concluded that it was one of the greatest contributors to the spread of Shī'ism in Iran. The reason being that whatever it entails, i.e. the displays of remorse, wailing, and the beating of drums and the abundance of flags which go with them; all naturally lead to the entrenchment of the Shī'ī ideology in the recesses of the hearts by touching the sensitive cords therein.⁴

1 Ibid. p. 58.

2 Ibid. p. 58; *Tārīkh al-Ṣawafīyyīn* p. 55.

3 Al-Shaybī: *al-Fikr al-Shī'ī* p. 415.

4 Al-Wardī: *Lamaḥāt Ijtīmā'iyyah* p. 59.

Moving on, the scholars of the Shī'ah helped the Safawid rulers in taking Shī'ism through the various stages of extremism and enforcing it upon the people with weaponry and fire. The most prominent among them was their scholar 'Alī al-Karakī whom the Shī'ah accord the title '*al-Muḥaqqiq al-Thānī*' (the second eminent research scholar) and whom Shāh Tahmasp, the son of Shāh Ismā'īl, had taken as a close advisor. The latter had accorded him the status of the obeyed issuer of orders in the state. This al-Karakī had contrived many innovations in Shī'ism, one being the sand upon which the Shī'ah prostrate in their prayers on which he wrote a book in the year 933 A.H. He also wrote a book regarding the permissibility of prostrating to a servant (human)² due to complying with Ismā'īl al-Ṣafawī whose friends would flatter him to the extent of even at times worshipping him and prostrating before him.³

The many innovations which he contrived in the Shī'ī dogma propelled some non-Shī'ī writers to accord him the title the 'Inventor of the Shī'ah'.⁴ He also wrote a book regarding reviling Abū Bakr and 'Umar رضي الله عنهما which he named *Nafaḥāt al-Lāhūt fī La'n al-Jibt wa al-Ṭāghūt* (the divine breezes regarding the cursing of *Jibt* and *Ṭāghūt*).⁵

It is also said that he was the person to initiate the reviling of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم in the Masjids on Fridays.⁶

Another scholar of the Safawid dynasty was al-Majlisī who partnered with the rulers in converting the Muslims in Iran. It is claimed that his book *Nūr al-Yaqīn* was the cause of the conversion of seventy thousand Iranian Sunnīs to Shī'ism.⁷

1 'Alī ibn Hilāl al-Karakī d. 984 A.H. (See: *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 42/200-201; *Muqtabas al-Athar* 22/333)

2 *Al-Fikr al-Shī'ī* p. 416 (with reference to his biography in *Rawāt al-Jannāt* p. 404).

3 Al-Ḥaydarī therefore says that Ismā'īl al-Ṣafawī parted from the path of Rafḍ and claimed divinity; his soldiers would prostrate before him. (See: *'Unwān al-Majd* 116-117).

4 Al-Nawāqīḍ: *al-Waraqah* p. 98.

5 *Al-Fikr al-Shī'ī* p. 416.

6 Ibid.

7 Donalds: *'Aqīdah al-Shī'ah* p. 302.

This is probably from the exaggerations of the Shī'ah, because Shī'ism did not gain traction in Iran by way of academics and persuasion, but rather by way of coercion and threatening.

The next generation grew up in an ambiance of the Ḥusaynī commemorations which were sensationalised to an extent that the younger generation would definitely be overwhelmed with hatred and anger. This led to them not wanting to listen to any evidence or argument.

Also, al-Majlisī's book *Biḥār al-Anwār* had a very great effect in the spread of extremism in the Shī'ah. This is because the readers of the *Ta'ziyah* (condolences) and the orators would draw from it whatever they found appealing and as a result filled the minds of people with extremisms and myths.

This book was one of the first books which was published on a very large scale during the Qajar era. Many copies were sent to Iraq which led to the spread of much of its unreliable information amidst the circles of the Iraqi community, similar to what had transpired in Iran.¹

The other angle of the impact of the Safawid dynasty should also not be neglected; and that is the various wars that it waged against the Muslim empire, its collaboration with the Portuguese and the English, its approbation of building churches and the missionary movements of the priests with who they teamed up with them in combatting the Sunnah and its adherents.²

These are but a few indications to the influences of their dynasty in this sphere.

I conclude the discussion with the words of Ibn Taymiyyah regarding the topic, which if read and applied to the reality, and in light of which if history is read, you will see the truth of it as clear as the daylight. He says:

1 *Lamaḥāt Ijtīmā'īyyah* p. 77-78.

2 See the details in: *Tārīkh al-Ṣawāfiyyīn* p. 93, onwards; Jamīl al-Miṣrī: *Ḥāḍir al-'Ālam al-Islāmī* p. 117.

فليُنظر كل عاقل فيما حدث في زمانه، وما يقرب من زمانه من الفتن والشُرور والفساد في الإسلام فأَنه يجد معظم ذلك من قبل الرافضة، وتجدهم من أعظم الناس فتنة وشرًا، وإنهم لا يقعدون عما يمكنهم من الفتن والشُرور وأيقاع الفساد بين الأمة

Every intelligent person should consider all the trials, evils and corruptions that occurred in his time, and the near past. He will find that most of them are from the side of the Shī'ah. You will find that they are the greatest instigators of fitnah and that they do not desist from causing any fitnah, evil and corruption in the Ummah which is within their reach.¹

He also says:

وقد علمنا بالمعاينة والتواتر أن الفتن والشُرور العظيمة التي لا تشبهها فتن إنما تخرج عنهم

And we know through observation and diffuse transmission that the great calamities and evils which are unmatched by any other in kind all come from them.²

The Social Sphere

This is a very vast topic, but I will allude to some aspects thereof.

Firstly: Their rapport with the Muslims

The Shī'ah live with the Muslims and carry a Muslim identity and there is no difference between them and the rest. And the default ruling in the relationships within Muslims is love, affection, mutual care and preference.

Islam has grounded the foundations of love between a Muslim and his brother, and the generation of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ set the highest precedent of love, loyalty, and adherence to the Qur'ān and the Sunnah. There is no doubt that this type of

1 Minhāj al-Sunnah 3/243.

2 Ibid. 3/245.

unity and mutual respect was always one of the targets of the enemy wanting to destroy the Ummah.

Hence the ploys of the enemy in destroying this firm Islamic structure have been many, one among them being their entrance into Shī'ism thereby deploying it as an instrumental tool to eliminate this firm and solid foundation of the Muslim society.

Hence it is very common and well-known that the relationship of a Shī'ī with others is based upon his desire to harm the next person in whichever way possible considering that to be a means of drawing closer to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.

Bearing hatred and malice discreetly is from their characteristics, disloyalty and the discarding of rights is within their disposition and deception, breaching of trusts, cunningness and misrepresentation are from their well-known actions, which at times even reach the extent of murder.

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

وأما الرافضي فلا يعاشر أحدا إلا استعمل معه النفاق. فإن دينه الذي في قلبه دين فاسد يحمله على الكذب والخيانة وغش الناس وإرادة السوء بهم. فهو لا يألوهم خبالا ولا يترك شرا يقدر عليه إلا فعله بهم. وهو ممقوت عند من لا يعرفه، وإن لم يعرف أنه رافضي تظهر على وجهه سيما النفاق وفي لحن القول، ولهذا تجده ينافق ضعفاء الناس ومن لا حاجة به إليه لما في قلبه من النفاق الذي يضعف قلبه

As for the Shī'ī, he does not deal with anyone but by deploying hypocrisy with him. Because the false religion which is in his heart propels him to lie, breach trusts, deceive people and intend evil for them. Hence he does not fall short of causing them ruination and does not leave any evil which is within his reach but perpetrates it against them. He is despised even by those who do not know him due to the signs of hypocrisy being evident on his face and in his speech. Hence you will find that he always practices hypocrisy with the weak people and those who do not have any need for him due to the hypocrisy in his heart which weakens it.¹

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/260.

Similarly, Al-Shawkānī has presented a few personal experiences which he experienced during his stay with the Shī'ah in Yemen. He has revealed some very strange matters and has emphasised that:

لأمانة لرافضي قط على من يخالفه في مذهبه ويدين بغير الرضى، بل يستحل ماله ودمه عند أدنى فرصة تلوح له، لأنه عنده مباح الدم والمال وكل ما يظهره من المودة فهو تقية يذهب أثره بمجرد إمكان الفرصة

A Shī' cannot be trusted at all regarding a person who opposes him in his beliefs and adheres to a creed other than the creed of the Shī'ah. He will violate his blood and wealth at the occurrence of the slightest opportunity due to his blood and wealth being violable according to him. All the love that he expresses is owing to Taqiyyah which fades away as soon as the possibility of an opportunity comes about.¹

Whilst discussing the factuality of this, he mentions the experiences he has had with this cult:

وقد جربنا هذا كثيرا فلم نجد رافضيا يخلص المودة لغير رافضي وإن أثره بجميع ما يملكه، وكان له بمنزلة الخول، وتودد إليه بكل ممكن، ولم نجد في مذهب من المذاهب المبتدعة ولا غيرها ما نجده عند هؤلاء من العداوة لمن خالفهم، فإنه يلعن أقبح اللعن ويسب أفظع السب كل من تجري بينه وبينه أدنى خصومة وأحقر جدال، وأقل اختلاف، ولعل سبب هذا والله أعلم أنهم لما تجروا على سب السلف الصالح هان عليهم سب من عداهم، ولا جرم فكل شديد ذنب يهون ما دونه

We have experienced this a lot and did not find any Shī' who sincerely loves anyone besides a Shī', even if he (the non-Shī') give preference to him in everything that he owns, becomes to him like a slave (to his master), and tries to win his admiration in every possible way. We have not found the type of hatred we saw in them in any of the other heterodox sects or in any other group for that matter. Likewise the boldness to defame respected and prominent people which we have witnessed in them, we have not seen in anyone else. Hence a Shī' will curse in the worst of ways and swear abhorrently any person with who he happens to have the smallest of

1 *Talab al-'Ilm* p. 70-71.

disputes and the most insignificant of quarrels. Probably the reason for this is, Allah knows best, that when they became bold in reviling the pious predecessors it became trivial for them to revile those besides them. And why not, because every severe sin trivialises those lighter than it.¹

Al-Shawkānī also alludes to the fact that they do not hesitate in committing any crime in an Islamic society and do not steer clear of any impermissible act. He says:

وقد جربنا وجرب من قبلنا فلم يجدوا رجلا رافضيا يتنزه عن محرمات الدين كائنا ما كان ولا تغتر بالظواهر، فإن الرجل قد يترك المعصية في المأى ويكون أعف الناس عنها في الظواهر وهو إذا أمكنته فرصة انتهزها انتهاز من لا يخاف نارا ولا يرجو جنة.

We have experienced and those before us also experienced. We have not found one Shīʿī person who steers clear of the impermissible acts of Dīn however severe they may be. Do not be deceived by the external, because a person might at times leave a sin in the presence of people and seem as if he is the most chaste and pure of people, but when the opportunity strikes he seizes it like a person who has no fear of hell-fire and no hope of Jannah.

He then goes onto mention some of his personal experiences. He says:

وقد رأيت منهم من كان مؤذنا ملازما للجماعات فأنكشف سارقا، وآخر كان يؤم الناس في بعض مساجد صنعاء، وله سميت حسن وهدى عجيب وملازمة للطاعة، وكنت أكثر التعجب منه كيف يكون مثله رافضيا ثم سمعت بعد ذلك عنه بأمور تقشعر لها الجلود وترجف منها القلوب.

I saw a Muʾadhdhin who was punctual in his congregational prayers but was later exposed and found to be a thief. Likewise there was another person who was an Imām in one of the Masjids of Ṣanʿāʾ and had very good conduct, a unique way and was always engaged in obedience. I would muse at the fact that how can such a person be a Shīʿī, but thereafter I heard such things about him as make the hair stand and the hearts tremor.

1 Ibid. p. 71.

He then makes mention of a third person who had slight leanings toward Shī'ism. Those leanings soon progressed and eventually resulted in him writing a book regarding the demerits of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. Al-Shawkānī says:

و كنت أعرف عنه في مبادئ أمره صلابة وعفة، فقلت: إذا كان ولا بد من رافضي عفيف فهذا. ثم سمعت منه بفواقر نسأل الله الستر والسلامة

In his initial stages I knew him to have firmness in faith and chastity, and I would thus say that if there is a Shī'ī who is pure than it is this person. But subsequently I heard some back-breaking (grave) matters from him. We ask Allah for concealment and safety.¹

He thereafter says:

وأما وثوب هذه الطائفة على أموال اليتامى والمستضعفين ومن يقدر أن يظلمه كائنا من كان فلا يحتاج إلى برهان، بل يكفي مدعيه إحالة منكرة على الاستقرار والتبعية فإنه سيطفر عند ذلك بصحة ما ذكرناه

As for the capturing of this cult of the wealth of the orphans and the weak and whoever they can oppress, it does not require evidence. Rather it is sufficient for the one who claims this to direct the denier thereof to do a survey and study in this regard, for he will surely find that which attests to the veracity of what we have mentioned.²

These are important testimonies which al-Shawkānī has enlisted and in them he has illustrated what Shī'ism does to a person and how it impacts on his relationship with the Muslims. They are crucial because he stayed with this cult of the Shī'ah in Yemen who progressed from the confines of the Zaydī sect and eventually embraced Rafḍ, as is known regarding the Jārūdiyyah.³

1 *Ṭalab al-'Ilm* p. 73.

2 Ibid. 74.

3 The Zaydī Jārūdiyyah, even though they have named themselves the Zaydiyyah, they are Rāfiḍah in that they excommunicate the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم. Hence the leading scholar of the Twelvers al-Mufīd has deemed the Zaydiyyah not to be part of the Shī'ah in his book *Awā'il al-Maqālat* but has excluded the Jārūdiyyah due to them being on his dogma. (See: p. 59 of this book).

Someone might object that this testification of al-Shawkānī is a testification of an opponent of the Shī'ah and hence cannot be held against them. But the reality is that the Ahl al-Sunnah are much more just, impartial, and pious than can slip into oppressing these sects and lying against them, as is established in history. In fact the Ahl al-Sunnah are better for the Shī'ah and are much more just to them than they are to each other. This is what they acknowledge themselves. They say, "Your justice for us is more than our justice for each other."¹

Furthermore, I came across a very important narration in *al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī which confirms the statements of al-Shawkānī and acknowledges the veracity of what he has said and acknowledgement is the chief of all evidence. This narration talks of the propensity of a Shī'ī when he deals with people. It states that a Shī'ī by the name 'Abd Allah ibn Kaysān asked their Imām:

إني...نشأت في أرض فارس وإنني أخالط الناس في التجارات وغير ذلك فأخالط الرجل فأرى له حسن السم، وحسن الخلق، وكثرة أمانة، ثم أفتشه فأتبينه من عداوتكم (يعني أهل السنة). وأخالط الرجل فأرى منه سوء الخلق وقلة أمانة وزعارة ثم أفتشه فأتبينه عن ولايتكم

I grew up in the lands of Persia and I mix with the people in business transactions and other interactions. I at times deal with a person and see that he has good conduct, good character, and immense trustworthiness. Subsequently when I investigate regarding him I discover that he is from your enemies (i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah). And at other times I deal with a person and see that he has bad conduct, lack of trust, and evil character.² Subsequently when I investigate regarding him I discover that he is from your friends...³

This narration acknowledges that the Ahl al-Sunnah have good character, immense trustworthiness, and sublime conduct and conversely it describes the Shī'ah with the opposite of these traits.

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/39.

2 *Za'ārah* means evil character. And in some manuscripts the word is *Da'ārah* which translates as corruption, sinning and defilement.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 2/4; *Tafsīr Nūr al-Thaqalayn* 4/47.

In another narration of *al-Kāfi* a person complains to his Imām that he discerns rashness, sharpness, and anger in his fellow Shī'ah and that he is deeply saddened because of that, whereas on the other hand he discerns in their opponents the Ahl al-Sunnah good conduct. The Imām tells him:

لا تقل حسن السميت ولكن قل حسن السيماء، فإن الله عز وجل يقول سِيمَاهُمْ فِي وُجُوهِهِمْ مِنْ أَثَرِ السُّجُودِ.

Do not say *Hasan al-Samt*¹ because Samt refers to a path, but rather say *Hasan al-Sīmā* because Allah ﷻ says: Their mark, i.e. sign, is one their faces, i.e. foreheads, from the trace of prostration.²

The narrator continues, “So I said, “I see him as having good *Sīmā*, signs, and dignity and am deeply saddened because of that...”³

Likewise we have a third Shī'ī by the name 'Abd Allah ibn Abū Ya'fūr who cannot stop musing at the vast difference between the character of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the character of the Shī'ah. He raises the issue to his Imām and says:

إني أخالط الناس فيكثر عجبني من أقوام لا يتولونكم ويتولون فلانا فلانا لهم أمانة وصدق ووفاء، وأقوام يتولونكم (يعني الراضية) ليس لهم تلك الأمانة ولا الوفاء والصدق قال: فاستوى أبو عبد الله جالسا فأقبل علي كالغضبان، ثم قال: لا دين لمن دان الله بولاية إمام جائر ليس من الله، ولا عتب على من دان بولاية إمام عادل من الله. قلت: لا دين لأولئك ولا عتب على هؤلاء. قال نعم

“I intermingle with the people and my amazement increases regarding those who do not associate with you and associate with so and so and so

1 It is a known fact in language that *Samt* is used in the meaning of dignity and conduct just as it is used in the meaning of path. The author of *al-Miṣbāḥ* says, “*Samt* means path, moderation, serenity, dignity and conduct.

2 Sūrah al-Faṭḥ: 29.

3 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* 2/11. The answer of their Imām to these complaints was acknowledging them and assigning them to the nature of the essential soil wherefrom each group was created. Hence he confirms the matter and does not deny it. Also refer to what has passed regarding their doctrine of *al-Ṭīnah* on p. 1276 of this book.

and so¹ due to them having trustworthiness, truthfulness, and loyalty; and regarding those who associate with you (i.e. the Shī'ah) but do not have that level of trustworthiness, loyalty and truthfulness.” He said, “The Imām sat upright and faced me as though angry and said, “There is no Dīn for a person who worships Allah by acknowledging the rulership of a tyrant ruler who is not from Allah and there is no blame upon the one who is devoted to him by acknowledging the rulership of a just ruler who is from Allah.” I then asked, “There is thus no religion for those people and there is no blame upon these people?” He said, “Yes.”²

This answer of the Imām which rejects any blame and reprimand which is directed to them even though they commit major sins is what has led them to this deep abyss of undermining and trivialising the perpetration of crimes. Because Dīn according to them is only acknowledging the Imām and the love of ‘Alī, in the presence of which no sin is harmful. Therefore, as long as this false premise is not reformed this phenomenon will remain in them.

It should likewise be noted that their books acknowledge kidnapping and eliminating the enemy therewith, and only consider the safety of the Shī'ī to be prerequisite. The books of the Shī'ah narrate from Dāwūd ibn Farqad that he asked Abū ‘Abd Allah the following:

ما تقول في قتل الناصب؟ فقال: حلال الدم، ولكنني أتقي عليك فإن قدرت أن تقلب عليه حائطاً أو تغرقه في ماء كيلا يشهد عليك فافعل

“What do you say regarding killing a Nāṣibī?”

He replied, “His blood is permissible to claim. But I fear for you. Hence if you can drop a wall on him or drown him in water so that he does not testify against you then do so.”³

1 The people meant are Abū Bakr and ‘Umar, as stated by the commentators of *al-Kāfī*. Hence this is an indication to the Ahl al-Sunnah

2 *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* 1/375.

3 Ibn Bābawayh: *‘Ilal al-Sharā’i’* p. 200; al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī: *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 18/463; al-Majlisī: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 27/231.

Likewise in *Rijāl al-Kashshī* it is reported that one of the Shī'ah informs his Imām how he managed to kill a group of his opponents. He says:

منهم من كنت أصعد سطحه بسلم حتى أقتله، ومنهم من دعوته بالليل على بابه فإذا خرج علي قتلته،
ومنهم من كنت أصحبه في الطريق فإذا خلا لي قتلته

Among them was a person whose roof I climbed with a ladder and thereafter killed him. Among them was a person who I would called out to at his door at night and when came out I killed him. And another person I would accompany on the street and when the streets would be empty I killed him.¹

He goes on to tell the Imām that he killed thirteen Muslims in this way because he assumed that they disassociate themselves from 'Alī.²

Similarly, their scholar Ni'mat Allah al-Jazā'irī states that the following appears in their traditions:

إن علي بن يقطان وهو وزير الرشيد قد اجتمع في حبسه جماعة من المخالفين، فأمر غلمانهم وهدموا
أسقف المحبس على المحبوسين فماتوا كلهم وكانوا خمسمائة رجل تقريبا، فأراد الخلاص من تبعات
دمائهم، فأرسل إلى الإمام مولانا الكاظم (ع) فكتب إليه جواب كتابه بأنك لو كنت تقدمت إلي قبل قتلهم
لما كان عليك شيء من دمائهم وحيث إنك لم تتقدم إلي فكفر عن كل رجل قتل منهم بئس والتيس
خير منه

In the prison of the Minister of al-Rashīd 'Alī ibn Yaqtān³ a group of the opponents ended up together. Hence he ordered his slaves who demolished the roof of his prison upon the prisoners as a result of which they all died. They were five hundred in number. Thereafter, wanting to exonerate himself from their murder he sends a letter to the Imām our master al-

1 *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 342-343.

2 Ibid.

3 Al-Jazā'irī has described him as one of the elite of the Shī'ah. (See: *al-Anwār al-Nu'māniyyah* 2/308). And al-Ṭabarī mentions that he was killed as a heretic. (See: p. 787-788 of this book).

Kāẓim who wrote back to him saying, “Had you come to me before you killed them you would not have been responsible. But because you did not come to me atone for each of them with one goat. And even a goat is better than them.”¹

See how they stay amidst the Muslims and wait for any opportunity to kill. These are their confessions which attest to their evil effects. Their Imām here sanctions the killing of five hundred Muslims just because they are not Shī‘ah and orders the killer to atone for their murder with goats due to him not seeking permission in advance. This implies that if a Shī‘ī seeks permission from the Imām or his jurist representative he can do whatever he wants, and if he does not seek permission then he should atone by giving a goat.

Commenting upon the goat as a blood penalty al-Jazā’irī says:

فانظر إلى هذه الدية الجزيلة التي لا تعادل دية أخيهم الأصغر وهو كلب الصيد فإن ديتة عشرون درهماً، ولا دية أخيهم الأكبر وهو اليهودي أو المجوسي فإنها ثمانمائة-كذا- درهم وحالهم في الآخرة أخس وأبخس

Look at this big blood penalty which is not equal to the blood penalty of their small brother, the hunting dog, which is twenty Dirhams. Nor is it equal to the blood penalty of their elder brother, a Jew or a fire worshipper, which is eight hundred Dirhams. Their condition in the afterlife will be worse and more insignificant.²

The reprehensibility of this statement speaks for itself and does not require any comment. It tells us of the amount of hatred they hold for the Ahl al-Sunnah and that they consider them to be more steeped in disbelief than even the fire-worshippers.

1 *Al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah* 2/308.

2 *Al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah* 2/308.

Secondly: Internal conflicts

These are the conflicts which they instigate due to reviling the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم in their yearly mourning ceremonies. Hence since the era of the Buwayhids, from the fourth century in Baghdād, mourning ceremonies are organized in order to revive the martyrdom of Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه. In these ceremonies the Shī'ah instigate problems and conflicts which know no limits. As a result vehement conflicts break out between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī'ah due to them boldly swearing and cursing the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. The first conflict which occurred in the history of Baghdād was in the year 338 A.H.¹ and ever since these conflicts continue.² In these conflicts many Muslims were killed and up to the present day the effects of this innovation still plague the Muslim world.

How many lives were lost, how much of hatred was planted, and how much of disunity and conflict were engendered. But despite this a leading scholar of the Shī'ah Khomeini worsens the problem and says on the Iranian television in one sentence:

إن شعار الفرقة الناجية وعلامتهم الخاصة من أول الإسلام إلى يومنا هذا إقامة المآتم

The distinctive symbol of the group which will attain salvation and their unique feature is establishing the ceremonies of mourning.³

He also says:

إن البكاء على سيد الشهداء (ع) وإقامة المجالس الحسينية هي التي حفظت الإسلام منذ أربعة عشر قرناً

Crying over the Leader of the Martyrs and establishing the Ḥusaynī gatherings is what kept Islam alive for fourteen centuries.⁴

1 'Abd al-Razzāq al-Ḥaṣān: *al-Mahdī wa al-Mahdawiyyah* p. 74.

2 See for examples the incidents of the years: 406, 408, 421, 422, 425, 439, 443, 444, 445, 447, 478, 481, 482, 486, etc. in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* and the other books of history.

3 This was reported by the Iranian Sunnī scholar Muḥammad Ḍiyā'ī in the *al-Mujtama'* magazine, edition no. 589, published on the 18th of Dhū al-Ḥijjah 1402 A.H.

4 The *al-Iṭṭilā'āt* magazine, edition no. 15901, published on the 16th of Sha'bān 1399 A.H. (taken from the book *Iqnā' al-Lā'im 'alā Iqāmat al-Ma'ātim*, cover page).

Likewise, the statement of one of their scholars regarding these mourning ceremonies being from the sanctified symbols of Allah has passed already.¹

Nonetheless, Allah ﷻ had blessed Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ with martyrdom on that day. In those who were martyred before him there was an ideal example for him. His murder was indeed a great calamity, and Allah ﷻ has made *Istirjā'*, saying *Innā Lillāh wa Innā Ilayhi Rāji'ūn*, lawful at the time of a calamity.² But what the Shī'ah do has nothing to do with Islam. The only motive of those who invented it is keeping the Muslim Ummah busy within itself so that it does not find space to spread the Dīn of Allah upon the earth.

Thirdly, Libertinism

Part of the influence they have had on the social level is the libertinism which they espouse, whose means they facilitate and which they practice in the Muslim society in the name of lending sexual rights,³ or what they otherwise call Mut'ah under the pretext of which they commit adultery. This is because their Mut'ah entails a secretive agreement⁴ upon cohabiting with any woman who consents

1 See p. 1460 of this book.

2 *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 4/511.

3 In their narrations it appears that al-Ḥasan al-'Aṭṭār says, "I asked Abū 'Abd Allah عَمَّا لَكَ regarding the lending of sexual rights and he said, "There is nothing wrong." (*Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 7/536-537; *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* 2/185; *al-Istibṣār* 3/141.

4 Al-Ṭūsī says, "It is permissible for him to do Mut'ah with her without the permission of her parents and without any announcement..." (See: *al-Nihāyah* p. 490).

even though she be a prostitute¹ or a married woman.² It is okay for him to agree with her for a day or for one or two times.³

1 Al-Ṭūsī says, “It is okay for a man to do Mut’ah with a prostitute (*al-Nihāyah* p. 490). And Khomeini says, “It is permissible to do Mut’ah with a prostitute (*Tahrīr al-Wasīlah* 2/292). The following narration also appears in their books:

عن إسحاق بن جرير قال: قلت لأبي عبد الله عليه السلام: إن عندنا بالكوفة امرأة معروفة بالفجور أيجل أن أتزوجها متعة؟ قال: فقال: رفعت راية؟ قلت: لا لو رفعت راية أخذها السلطان. قال نعم تزوجها متعة قال: ثم أصغى إلى بعض مواله فأسر إليه شيئا، فقلت: مولاه فقلت له: ما قال لك؟ فقال إنما قال لي: ولو رفعت راية ما كان عليه في تزويجها شيء. إنما يخرجها من حرام إلى حلال.

Ishāq ibn Jarīr says, “I asked Abū ‘Abd Allah عليه السلام, “In Kūfah there is a woman who is well known for prostitution, would it be permissible for me to contract a Mut’ah marriage with her?” He asked, “Has she raised a banner?” I said, “No, if she raises a banner the ruler will take it.” He thus replied, “Yes contract a Mut’ah marriage with her.” He then turned toward one of his slaves and whispered something to him. Later when I met his slave I asked him, “What did he say to you?” He said, “He told me that even if she raised a banner there wouldn’t be any problem for him in marrying her. Because he would be taking her out from the unlawful to the lawful.” (*Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 14/455; *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* 2/249).

2 The following appears in their narrations:

عن محمد بن عبد الله الأشعري قال: قلت للرضا (ع) الرجل يتزوج بالمرأة فيقع في قلبه أن لها زوجا. فقال: وما عليه

Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allah al-Ash’arī mentions, “I asked al-Riḍā عليه السلام, “At times a person marries a woman and then it occurs to him that she is married.” He said, “There is no blame upon him.” (*Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 14/457; *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* 2/187).

Likewise Ja’far was asked, as they allege:

إن فلانا تزوج امرأة متعة فقبل له إن لها زوجا فساها فقال أبو عبد الله (ع): ولم سألها

So and so contracted a Mut’ah marriage with a woman. Later he was told that she has a husband. He thus asked her. Abū ‘Abd Allah said, “Why did he ask her?” (Previous two references).

And their scholar al-Ṭūsī says that a person does not have to ask a lady whether she has a husband or not. (*Al-Nihāyah* p. 490).

3 See: *al-Nihāyah* p. 491; al-Khumainī: *Tahrīr al-Wasīlah* 2/290. It is recorded in their narrations that:

عن خلف بن حماد قال: أرسلت إلى أبي الحسن (ع) كم أدنى أجل المتعة؟ هل يجوز أن يتمتع الرجل بشرط مرة واحدة؟ فقال: نعم

Khalaf ibn Ḥammād says, “I sent a message to Abū al-Ḥasan عليه السلام asking him, what the minimum period of Mut’ah is? Is it ok for a person do to Mut’ah with her with the condition of just one time?” He said, “Yes.” (*Furū’ al-Kāfi* 2/46; *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 14/479).

Some have even confessed to Shaykh Muḥammad Naṣīf that the Shī'ah often engage in *Mut'ah Dawriyyah* as well due to a plan which some of their scholars have devised for them.¹

Al-Ālūsī therefore says:

من نظر إلى أحوال الرافضة في المتعة في هذا الزمان لا يحتاج في حكمه عليهم بالزنا إلى برهان، فإن المرأة الواحدة تزني بعشرين رجلا في يوم وليلة وتقول إنها متمتعة، وقد هيأت عندهم أسواق عديدة للمتعة توقف فيها النساء ولها قوادون يأتون بالرجال إلى النساء وبالنساء إلى الرجال فيختارون ما يرضون ويعينون أجرة الزنا ويأخذون بأيديهن إلى لعنة الله تعالى وغضبه

A person who considers the condition of the Shī'ah in these times will not require any evidence to conclude that what they indulge in is prostitution. At times one woman commits fornication with twenty men in a day and night averring that she is doing *Mut'ah*. Likewise, there are several markets which have been prepared in which women are kept. These markets have managers who bring men to women and women to men. As a result they

1 *Mut'ah Dawriyyah* is when a group of people all do *Mut'ah* with one woman one after the other (*Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfa al-Ithnay 'Ashariyyah* p. 227). Also see what Shaykh al-Ānī has mentioned regarding its proliferation in some seminaries of Najaf (*al-Dharī'ah Li Izālāh Shubah Kuttāb al-Shī'ah* 45-46).

Shaykh Muḥammad al-Naṣīf was able to bring forth a confession from one of their scholars who goes by the name Aḥmad Sarḥān regarding *Mut'ah Dawriyyah*. Naṣīf asked the Shī'ī, "According to the Ahl al-Sunnah the abrogation of *Mut'ah* is confirmed, not so according to the Shī'ah. But I do not know what evidence you advance regarding *Mut'ah Dawriyyah*." To which the Shī'ī responded:

بأن المتمتع بالمرأة يعقد عليها بعد نهاية تمتعه منها عقد زواج دائم ثم يطلقها قبل الدخول فتصبح لا عدة عليها، فيتمتع بها آخر ويفعل كالأول... فتدور المرأة على مجموعة من الرجال بهذه الطريقة بلا عدة

A person who contracts a *Mut'ah* marriage with a woman contracts a permanent marriage with her after the duration of the *Mut'ah* and thereafter divorces her before consummating the (permanent) marriage with her owing to which she is not required to sit in *'iddah* (the waiting period). Subsequently another person then contracts a *Mut'ah* marriage with her and does exactly what the first person did. In this way one woman goes through different men without having to sit in *'iddah* (the waiting period). (See: The *al-Fatḥ* magazine, edition no. 845, published in Rajab 1366 A.H.)

choose what they like and stipulate a fee for the fornication. They hold the hands of these ladies and take them toward the curse of Allah and his anger.¹

He then goes onto mention the details and tales of what happens there.²

Furthermore, they drive men and women toward this act with threats and with temptations due to it being the best of deeds according to them³ and due to destruction awaiting the one who does not engage in it on the Day of Judgment.⁴

1 *Kashf 'Ayāhib al-Jahālāt* p. 3 (manuscript).

2 Ibid.

3 There are many Shī'ī traditions which suggest that Mut'ah is the best of deed according to them. To the extent that in a fabricated narration which they attribute to Rasūl Allah ﷺ the following appears:

من تمتع مرة فدرجته كدرجة الحسين، ومن تمتع مرتين فدرجته كدرجة الحسن، ومن تمتع ثلاث مرات فدرجته كدرجة علي، ومن تمتع أربع مرات فدرجته كدرجة علي

He who does Mut'ah once, his rank is like the rank of Ḥusain. He who does it twice, his rank is like the rank of Ḥasan. He who does it thrice his rank is like the rank of 'Alī. And he who does it four times, his rank is like my rank. (*Tafsīr Minhāj al-ṣādiqīn* p. 356).

They have left no door which leads to enticing people to commit adultery except that they have opened it. A person who reads their narrations in this regard will conclude that the fabricators thereof were liberals who desired to satisfy their lustful desires with Muslim women. Hence their narrations also state:

إذا تزوجها متعة لم يكلمها كلمة إلا كتب الله له بها حسنة، ولم يمد يده إليها إلا كتب الله له حسنة... فإذا اغتسل غفر الله له... بعدد الشعر

If he contracts a Mut'ah marriage with her, he will not speak a word to her but that Allah will record one good deed for him. He will likewise not extend his hand toward her but that Allah will write a virtue for him. Thereafter when he will bath Allah will forgive him as much as the hair on his body. (*Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 14/442; *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh* 2/151).

They also allege that a woman would turn down all those who proposed to her due to her not having any inclination toward marriage, but she later sent a message to her cousin inviting him to marry her through Mut'ah in order to disobey 'Umar, as the narration suggests. Hence she gave preference to adultery over the constitution of marriage. (Refer to their narrations regarding the alleged virtues of Mut'ah in the book *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah*: chapter regarding the desirability of Mut'ah 14/442, onwards).

4 One of their narrations state that a person who leaves the world without doing Mut'ah will appear on the Day of Judgement with his nose and ears cut. (See: *Tafsīr Minhāj al-ṣādiqīn* p. 356).

Their scholars likewise sanction anal sex. Their scholar Khomeini states:

والأقوى والأظهر جواز وطء الزوجة في الدبر

The stronger and more apparent view is that it is permissible to cohabit with a woman anally.¹

Now compare this with the verdict of Ibn Nujaym which states that considering anal sex with the wife to be permissible is Kufr, disbelief, according to majority of the scholars.²

All these various types of indulgence are not any different than the liberal tendencies of the Kharamiyyah, the followers of Mazdak and Bābak, and probably are not lesser than the liberal tendencies of the west as well.

The Shī'ah have taken advantage of the widespread ethical chaos to entice students with affordable Mut'ah so to embrace their faith, as has passed already.³

In fact some of their narrations clearly legalise adultery if it is done in lieu of a compensation:

عن عبد الرحمن بن كثير عن أبي عبد الله قال: جاءت امرأة إلى عمر فقالت إني زنت فطهرني فأمر بها أن ترجم فأخبر بذلك أمير المؤمنين (ع) فقال: كيف زنت. قال: مررت بالبادية فأصابني عطش شديد فاستسقيت أعرابيا فأبى أن يسقيني إلا إن أمكنه من نفسي فلما أجهدي العطش وخفت على نفسي سقاني فأمكنه من نفسي فقال أمير المؤمنين: تزويج ورب الكعبة

‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Kathīr narrates from Abū ‘Abd Allah, “A woman came to ‘Umar and said, “I have committed adultery so purify me.” Hence he ordered that she be lapidated.

Thereafter Amīr al-Mu’minīn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was informed and he asked, “How did you commit adultery?”

1 *Tahṛīr al-Wasīlah* 2/241.

2 *Al-Ashbāh wa al-Naẓā’ir* p. 191.

3 See p. 1579 of this book.

She said, “I was passing through the desert and was experiencing severe thirst. I thus sought water from a Bedouin, but he refused to give me water unless I gave him authority over myself. Hence when the thirst exhausted me and I feared upon myself he gave me water subsequent to which I gave him authority over myself.”

Amīr al-Mu’minīn replied, “A marriage by the Lord of the Ka’bah.”¹

Similarly, they do not confine their libertinism to their people, rather their Imām advises that they offer Mut’ah marriages to the women of the Ahl al-Sunnah² and even the woman of the Jews and the Christians.³

Hence their libertinism is comprehensive. It has not left any society but that it has corrupted it. They are, therefore, adulterers who live amidst the Muslims and carry a Muslim identity, but cause mischief in the lands, to which their verdicts and traditions abundantly attest.

The Economical Sphere

Shī’ism has left its effects in the economical sphere of the Muslims’ lives in different ways. One among them is that Shī’ figures have since the bygone eras taken the wealth of the Muslims under the deceiving pretext of the ‘right of the Ahl al-Bayt’, for which Allah has revealed no evidence. This wealth was always utilised in fulfilling their personal motives and exploited to conspire against the Ummah and plot against it.

Listen to this Serious Statement

The books of the Shī’ah say:

مات أبو الحسن (ع) وليس من قوامه أحد إلا وعنده المال الكثير، فكان ذلك سبب وقوفهم وجحودهم موته، وكان ع زياد القندي سبعون ألف دينار، وعند علي بن أبي حمزة ثلاثون ألف دينار، وكان أحد القوام عثمان بن عيسى وكان يكون في مصر وكان عنده مال كثير وست جوارى. قال: فبعث إليه أبو الحسن

1 *Furū’ al-Kāfi* 2/48; *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 14/471-472.

2 *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 14/452; *Furū’ al-Kāfi* 2/44.

3 *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 14/452; *Furū’ al-Kāfi* 2/188; *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faḥḥ* 2/148.

الرضا عليه السلام فيهن وفي المال. فكتب إليه: إن أباك لم يموت فكتب إليه: أن أبي قد مات وقد اقتسمنا ميراثه وقد صحت الأخبار بموته، فكتب إليه: إن لم يكن أبوك مات فليس لك من ذلك شيء وإن كان مات فلم يأمرني بدفع شيء إليك وقد اعتقت الجواري وتزوجتهن

Abū al-Ḥasan عليه السلام passed away and there was none among the caretakers of his wealth but that they had a lot of wealth, and thus that served as the cause for their hesitation and denial of his death. Ziyād al-Qandī had seventy thousand Dirhams and ‘Alī ibn Ḥamzah had thirty thousand Dirhams. One of the caretakers, whose name was ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Īsā and who was based in Egypt, had a lot of wealth and six slave girls. Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā wrote to him regarding the money and the slave girls. In response he wrote, “Your father has not died.” To which Abū al-Ḥasan responded by saying, “My father has passed away, we have distributed his inheritance and the reports of his death are credible.

He responded, “If your father did not die than there is no share for you in the wealth, and if he has died, then he has not ordered me to give anything to you. As for the slave girls I have freed them and married them.”¹

This report is taken from the books of the Twelvers. We will leave that aspect of this narration for which they advance this narration, i.e. to establish the invalidity of suspending ruling regarding the death of the Imām by drawing evidence from the response of their Imām al-Riḍā, and will rather focus on the disclosure the narration gives us regarding the greed for wealth which underpins their activities. This narration reveals that the only motive all those people who traversed the lands and claimed to be representative of an Imām from the Imāms had in mind was securing the biggest possible amount of wealth for themselves.

Hence by way of these false claims for the Imāms they would gather huge sums of money and which these clandestine elements would share amongst themselves.

Any person who considers the abundant Shī‘ī movements which emerged throughout the history of the Muslim Ummah, which distracted the Ummah from its enemies and which diverted its energies away from constructing the

1 ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusain ibn Bābawayh: *al-Imāmah* p. 75; *Rijāl al-Kashshī* p. 43 (no. 946), p. 598 (no. 1120; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 48/253; al-Ṭūsī: *al-Ghaybah* p. 43.

greatest Muslim empire should not be oblivious of the fact that all the funding for these movements was collected from the gullible followers in the name of the Ahl al-Bayt and their right of *Khums*, one fifth.

In fact, the Shīʿī movements of the present age still solicit all their funding from this avenue. And the scholars of the Shīʿah are thus considered to be from the prominent capitalists of the world. Therefore the position of being a scholar or a *Marjīʿ* is a position which the hearts yearn for and which the gazes look up to, i.e. due to them being positions upon which heaps of golds and silver are poured.

Similarly, this avenue of income is what sustained and continues to sustain all the publishing houses which publish hundreds of publications and books which are replete with content against the Ummah and its Dīn.

Furthermore, this immense wealth which is poured upon the Āyāt, scholars, and Marājīʿ, authorities, of the Shīʿah from the side of the beguiled followers is what has made the matter of the Shīʿah progress and their threat intensify. Hence, the scholars of the Shīʿah and their authorities began directing their fatwas to the ordinary people on the streets and concealed the realities and facts from them in order to conform to the populist information they were already exposed to.¹

The scholars of the Shīʿah have lent a lot of importance to the issue of wealth which they usurp from people in the name of *Khums*. To the extent that they consider a person who considers it permissible to withhold one Dirham to be a disbeliever.²

1 See: p. 1366 onwards (The Tenth Misconception) of this book.

2 They say, “A person who withholds one Dirham or less will be included in those who oppress them (i.e. the Ahl al-Bayt) and usurp their rights. Rather a person who considers that to be permissible is from the disbelievers. Abū Baṣīr narrates:

قلت لأبي جعفر عليه السلام: ما أيسر ما يدخل به العبد النار؟ قال: من أكل من مال اليتيم درهما ونحن اليتيم

I asked Abū Jaʿfar عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, “What is the lowest action due to which a servant will enter the fire?”

He said, “Eating the wealth of an orphan and we are the orphans.”

(Al-Yazdī: *al-ʿUrwah al-Wuthqā* 2/366. In the footnotes are the annotations of their contemporary scholars) Professor ʿAlī al-Sālūs whilst mocking this principle says that if the Muslims of today want that the Shīʿah do not excommunicate them they should send one fifth of their earnings and capitals to the scholars of the Shīʿah. (See: *Athar al-Imāmah fī al-Fiqh al-Jaʿfarī* p. 394 (footnote).

A person who studies Islamic jurisprudence will not find a single chapter which is dedicated solely to the topic of Khums. All that he will find is narrations regarding the Khums retrieved from booty in the chapter of Jihād. Likewise he will find a narration regarding the Khums which is to be paid upon certain minerals.

But the matter is completely different according to the Shī'ah. For in their books there is a chapter which is dedicated to Khums. Hereunder are some of their rulings regarding Khums:

فيما يفضل عن مؤونة السنة من أرباح التجارات ومن سائر التكتسبات من الصناعات، والزراعات والإيجارات حتى الخياطة والكتابة والنجارة والصيد وحياسة المباحات وأجرة العبادات الاستيجارية من الحج والصوم والصلاة-كذا- والزيارات وتعليم الأطفال وغير ذلك من الأعمال التي لها أجرة.

Khums will be taken out of whatever surplus remains after the expenses of the year are settled from the revenues of businesses and all other types of earnings, viz. occupations, farming, lease agreements, even sewing of clothes, writing, carpentry, hunting, the securing of things which are permissible by default and the wages paid for acts of worship for which wages are normally given: like Ḥajj, fasting, Ṣalāh, visitations, teaching children and all other actions for which wages are paid.¹

They even say:

بل الأحوط ثبوته في مطلق الفائدة، وإن لم تحصل بالإكتساب كالهبة والهدية والجائزة والمال الموصى به ونحوها.

It is rather safer that Khums be established in any benefit even though it is not procured through earning, likes gifts, presents, allowances and wealth which is bequeathed, etc.²

They have also considered it safer to take out Khums from the capital itself and from all the instruments and tools which are used, like a carpenter's instruments

1 Al-'Urwah al-Wuthqā 2/389.

2 Ibid.

of carpentry, a weaver's instruments of weaving and a farmer's instruments of farming. Hence it is safer to take out Khums for them as well in advance.¹

They even go to the extent of saying:

لو زاد ما اشتراه وادخره للمؤنة من مثل الحنطة والشعير ونحوها مما يصرف عنه فيها يجب إخراج خمسة
عند تمام الحول... ولو استغنى عن الفرش والأواني والألبسة والعبد والفرس والكتب وما كان مبناه على
بقاء عنه فالأحوط إخراج الخمس

If there is surplus in what he has bought and stored for seeing to expenses like wheat, barely and things of their kind which are used, it will be compulsory to take out one Khums from them as well at the end of the year... And if he does not require the spreads, utensils, clothing, the servant, the horse, the books and whatever else is itself required, then it is safer to take out one Khums from them as well.²

All this wealth is spent on whom?

The Shī'ah say that in the period of the occultation it will be granted to the Shī'ī jurist.³ Hence those who takeout Khums spend it upon the Shī'ī jurists.

To explain, their scholars assert that the Khums will be distributed into six shares:

سهم لله، وسهم للنبي صلى الله عليه وسلم، وسهم للإمام. وهذه الثلاثة الآن لصاحب الزمان

A share for Allah, a share for Nabī ﷺ and a share for the Imām. All these shares are now the right of the man of the time.⁴

1 Al-'Urwah al-Wuthqā 2/394-395.

2 Ibid. 2/395-396.

3 'Āl Kāshif al-Ghiṭā': al-Nūr al-Sāṭi': the chapter regarding the necessity of giving the Khums to the jurist in the era of occultation: 1/439.

4 Al-'Urwah al-Wuthqā 2/403; Hidāyah al-'Ibād p. 178.

i.e. for the awaited Mahdī who is absent and will never return from his occultation due to him never coming into existence. Hence in his absence the Shī'ī jurist becomes deserving of his share. The Shī'ah say:

النصف من الخمس الذي للإمام أمره في زمان الغيبة راجع إلى نائبه وهو المجتهد الجامع للشرائط

Half of the Khums which is the share of the Imām will be entrusted to his representative during the era of occultation, i.e. to the *Mujtahid*, the supreme jurist, who possesses all the requirements.¹

The other three shares are for the orphans, the poor and the travellers,² on condition that they have faith,³ i.e. they adhere to the Shī'ī dogma due to faith only being exclusive to them, as they allege. Regarding these three shares which they aver should be spent upon these classes of people they say that it is safer to submit them to the Shī'ī jurist as well.⁴

The conclusion, therefore, is that the Khums in its entirety is given to the scholars of the Shī'ah so that they may utilise it to spend upon themselves and upon the latter three categories. In the book *al-Nūr al-Sāṭi'* the following appears:

إن الفقيه يأخذ نصف الخمس لنفسه، ويقسم النصف الآخر منه على قدر الكفاية، فإن فضل كان له وإن أعوز أتمه من نصيبه

The Shī'ī jurist will take half of the Khums for himself and will distribute the remaining half of it as required. If anything remains it will be for him and if it falls short he will complete it from his share.⁵

Professor 'Alī al-Sālūs says:

1 *Al-'Urwah al-Wuthqā* 2/405; *Hidāyah al-'Ibād* p. 179.

2 *Al-'Urwah al-Wuthqā* 2/403; *Hidāyah al-'Ibād* p. 179.

3 *Ibid.*

4 *Al-'Urwah al-Wuthqā* 2/405; *Hidāyah al-'Ibād* p. 179.

5 *Al-Nūr al-Sāṭi'* 1/439.

ومن واقع الجعفرية في هذه الأيام نجد أن من أراد أن يحج يقوم كل ممتلكاته جميعا ثم يدفع خمس قيمتها إلى الفقهاء الذين أفتوا بوجوب هذا الخمس وعدم قبول حج من لم يدفع. واستحل هؤلاء الفقهاء أموال الناس بالباطل.

The reality of the Shī'ah today is that we find that whoever intends to perform Ḥajj evaluates all his assets and thereafter takes out Khums from it and gives it to the Jurists who have issued the fatwa of Khums being compulsory and of the Ḥajj of the one who does not submit it not being accepted. They have thereby made the wealth of people lawful by way of falsehood.¹

I would add that probably this is the reason why the state of the scholars wants an increase in the quota of the pilgrims every year.

This belief regarding Khums is from a result of the many results of the belief of Imāmah. The idea that all the wealth belongs to the Imām was contrived by the heretics of the bygone centuries and since then it has continued till today. Whereas the idea of Khums is an innovation which was innovated by these people and was not found in the time of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and the rightly guided Khulafā', in fact not even during the reign of Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī whose lovers and partisans they claim to be.

Ibn Taymiyah mentions:

وأما ما تقوله الرافضة من أن خمس مكاسب المسلمين يؤخذ منهم، ويصرف إلى من يرويه هو نائب الإمام المعصوم أو إلى غيره، فهذا قول لم يقله قط أحد من الصحابة لا علي ولا غيره ولا أحد التابعين لهم بإحسان ولا أحد من القرابة لا بني هاشم ولا غيرهم. وكل من نقل هذا عن علي أو علماء أهل بيته كالحسن والحسين وعلي بن الحسين وأبي جعفر الباقر وجعفر بن محمد فقد كذب عليهم. فإن هذا خلاف المتواتر من سيرة علي رضي الله عنه، فإنه قد تولى الخلافة أربع سنين وبعض أخرى ولم يأخذ من المسلمين من أموالهم شيئا، بل لم يكن في ولايته قط خمس مقسوم. وأما المسلمون فما خمس لا هو ولا غيره أموالهم. وأما الكفار فمتى عنمت منهم أموال خمسست بالكتاب والسنة، ولكن في عهده لم يتفرغ المسلمون لقتال الكفار بسبب ما وقع بينهم من الفتنة والاختلاف. وكذلك من المعلوم بالضرورة أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم لم يخمس أموال المسلمين ولا طلب أحدا قط من المسلمين بخمس ماله

1 *Athar al-Imāmah fī al-Fiqh al-Ja'farī* p. 391.

As for the claim of the Shī'ah that one fifth of the earnings of the Muslims will be taken from them and spent on whom they consider the representative of the infallible Imām or others besides him, it is a claim that none of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم ever made, not 'Alī and not anyone besides him, nor the subsequent generation who followed them meticulously. Likewise this claim was not made by any of the family members of Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم, the Banū Hāshim or anyone else.

Furthermore, whoever has reported this from 'Alī and the scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt, the likes of Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn, Abū Ja'far al-Bāqir, and Ja'far ibn Muḥammad has indeed lied against them. Because this is against what is categorically known regarding the life of 'Alī رضي الله عنه; he remained the Khalīfah of the Muslims for four odd years and did not claim anything from the wealth of the Muslims. Rather in his time there was never Khums which was to be distributed.

As for the Muslims, neither did he nor anyone else take Khums from their wealth. Yes when the wealth of the disbelievers was captured as booty Khums was taken therefrom in accordance with the Qur'ān and the Sunnah. But it should be noted that the Muslims were preoccupied with civil strife and internal conflict and thus did not have the time to wage war against the disbelievers during his reign. Likewise, it is a well-established fact that Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم did not take Khums from the wealth of the Muslims, nor did he ask any Muslim for Khums from his wealth.¹

Nonetheless, this wealth which the scholars of the Shī'ah take under the pretext of it being an Islamic obligation and a right from the rights of the Ahl al-Bayt, owing to which wealth abundantly flows toward them from every direction like a deluge, is probably the greatest reasons for the subsistence of the Twelver dogma till today; to it can be attributed the animated defence of the Shī'ī scholars of their dogma. Because they consider any person who targets their dogma as a person who is trying to deprive them of this wealth which is granted to them.

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/154.

Hence professor ‘Alī al-Sālūs says:

وأعتقد أنه لولا هذه الأموال لما ظل الخلاف قائما بين الجعفرية وسائر الأمة الإسلامية إلى هذا الحد،
فكثير من فقهاءهم يحرصون على إذكاء هذا الخلاف حرصهم على هذه الأموال

I presume that had it not been for these sums of wealth, the dispute between the Shī‘ah and the rest of the Muslim Ummah would not have remained to this extent. For many of their jurists desire the instigation of disputes as much as they desire these moneys.¹

Moving on, from their obvious influences another is that they try to capture most of the business enterprises, companies and avenues of revenue in the cities they reside in in order to manipulate the provisions of people and their needs. The reality on the ground is the biggest attestation to this.²

Likewise, from the other obvious influences that they have had upon the economy of this Ummah is those surreptitious movements whose motive is to destroy the economy of the Muslim state. This is due to the fact that the wealth of the Muslims holds no sanctity according to them and therefore is violable without the slightest of doubt.

Their narrations order them to do so. One narration states:

خذ مال الناصب حيثما وجدته وادفع إلينا الخمس

Take the wealth of a Nāṣib wherever you find it and submit a Khums of it to us.³

Likewise Abū ‘Abd Allah is reported to have said, as they allege:

1 *Athar al-Imāmah* p. 408.

2 *Wa Jā’ Dawr al-Majūs* p. 312, onwards.

3 *Tahdhib al-Aḥkām* 1/384; Ibn Idrīs: *al-Sarā’ir* p. 484; *Wasā’il al-Shī‘ah* 6/340.

The wealth of a Nāṣib and whatever he owns is violable.¹

It should be noted that the scholars of the Shī'ah have broadened the implication of “Nāṣib” and have included everyone besides the Twelvers therein.²

Similarly their books of jurisprudence mention:

إذا أغار المسلمون على الكفار فأخذوا أموالهم فالأحوط بل الأقوى إخراج خمسها من حيث كونها غنيمة
ولو في زمن الغيبة وكذا إذا أخذوا بالسرقة والغيلة

If the Muslims attack the disbeliever and take their assets, then it is safer rather more preferred to take out its Khums due to it being booty, even if it be during the era of occultation. Similar will be the ruling if they capture wealth by stealing or murdering.³

Also the following:

ولو أخذوا منهم بالربا أو بالدعوى الباطلة فالأقوى إلحاقه بالفوائد المكتسبة فيعتبر فيه الزيادة عن مؤنة
السنة وإن كان الأحوط إخراج خمس مطلقا

And if they take from them by way of usury or false claims, then the stronger position is that it be treated like the earned profits. Hence the surplus which remains after the expenses of the year will be taken into consideration. Although it is still safer to take out Khums therefrom unconditionally.⁴

1 Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām 2/48; Wasā'il al-Shī'ah 11/60.

2 Their narration explicitly state that Naṣb is giving preference to Abū Bakr and 'Umar عليه السلام over 'Alī عليه السلام. See: al-Sarā'ir p. 471; Wasā'il al-Shī'ah 6/341-342; Bashārah al-Muṣṭafā p. 51; al-Maḥāsin al-Nafsāniyyah fī Ajwibah al-Masā'il al-Khurāsāniyyah p. 138, onwards.

3 Al-'Urwah al-Wuthqā (with the footnotes of their leading scholar of this age) 2/367, 368.

4 Ibid. p. 368; Hidāyah al-'Ibād p. 168.

The term ‘disbeliever’ according to the Shī‘ah applies to majority of the Muslims, rather to all of them besides their cult, as has passed already.¹ This implies that they consider it permissible to capture the wealth of the Muslims by attacking them, stealing from them and murdering them. Likewise they consider it permissible to take the wealth of Muslims by way of usury and false claims. This is clearly illustrated in the historical incidents which the Shī‘ah were instrumental in. The theft which the state of the scholars exercises in the Arabian Gulf and the threat which it poses to the freedom of shipping therein, also, their capture over some of the steamships which pass in its waters considering them to be booty despite them being the property of Muslims are all attestations to this as well.

In conclusion, these are the influences and the ill-effects of the Shī‘ah. But do they have any positives and good influences which they have left in the history of the Ummah?

A precise and in-depth academic answer to this question demands a rigorous and comprehensive study of their circumstances, mannerisms and the details of their history. Fortunately, the scholars of Islam have spared us the task of doing so and have drawn the following conclusions:

There is not a single Shī‘ī Rāfiḍī scholar amongst the high ranking scholars of jurisprudence who are considered authorities in the field. Amongst the kings of the Muslims who served Islam, established it and strove against its enemies there is not a single Shī‘ī Rāfiḍī. Likewise, amidst the ministers who were exemplars in their conduct we do not find anyone who was a Shī‘ī Rāfiḍī.

Most of the Shī‘ah are found either amongst the hypocrites and heretics, amidst the ignoramuses who have no knowledge of the sciences based on reason or those based on revelation; they are people who grew up in villages and mountains and were thus aloof from the Muslims, owing to which they did not intermingle with and benefit from the people of knowledge and piety. Or they are from those driven

¹ See: p. 969, onwards of this book.

by their personal motives and desires owing to which they procure leadership and wealth, or from those who have a pedigree to which they are obstinately loyal like the people of Jāhiliyyah. There is not one Rāfiḍī amidst those whom the Muslims consider to be people of knowledge and Dīn.¹

The question still lingers, however, that they have written works in Qur'ānic exegesis, the sciences of ḥadīth, and jurisprudence; is that not considered to be a commendable contribution to the Islamic thought? I say a person who studies these collections will conclude that the good therein is taken from the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Hence whoever has written in the field of Qur'ānic exegesis, for example, has drawn from the exegesis works of the Ahl al-Sunnah,² and whatever they narrate from their people therein is darknesses enveloped in one another, like is clear from the *Tafsīr al-Qummī* and *Tafsīr al-Burhān*, etc.

As for ḥadīth, they are the most distant people from having knowledge regarding its chains of transmission and its texts. In whichever book they find what suits their fancies they quote it without any knowledge.³

As to *Fiqh*, jurisprudence, they are the furthest people therefrom. Whatever little benefit there is in their books is not originally from their scholars due to them being dependent upon the Ahl al-Sunnah in this regard. In Taymiyyah has revealed to us the ways in which they plagiarise the academic content from the books of the Jurists of the Muslims. He says:

وإذا صنف واحد منهم كتابا في الخلاف أخذوا حجة من يوافقهم، واحتجوا مما احتج به أولئك، وأجابوا عما يعارضهم بما يجيب به أولئك، فيظن الجاهل أن هذا قد صنف كتابا عظيما في الخلاف والفقه والأصول، ولا يدري الجاهل أن عامته استعارة من كلام علماء أهل السنة الذين يكفرونهم ويعادونهم وما انفردوا به، فلا يساوي مداده فإن المداد ينفع ويضر وهذا يضر ولا ينفع

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 1/223.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/246.

3 Ibid.

And when any of them writes a book regarding differences of the scholars or the principles of Fiqh, then if in a particular issue there is a dispute amongst the scholars they take the viewpoint of those who agree with them. They will use the evidences advanced by those scholars and will respond to counter arguments with their responses. Hence an ignorant person assume that so and so wrote a great work regarding the differences of scholars and the principles of Fiqh, but without realising that most of the content is plagiarised from the works of the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah who oppose them. As for their isolated views, they are not even equal to ink; because ink is beneficial and harmful whereas this is only harmful.¹

1 Ibid.

The Ruling regarding them

The First Discussion

The Ruling regarding them being Innovators and not Disbelievers

Imām al-Nawawī¹ says:

إن المذهب الصحيح المختار الذي قاله الأكثرون والمحققون أن الخوارج لا يكفرون كسائر أهل البدع

Surely the correct and preferred opinion which is held by the majority and research scholars is that the *Khawārij* are not to be excommunicated like the rest of the innovators.²

Mullā ‘Alī al-Qārī³ understood from this statement that Imām al-Nawawī was not of the opinion of the excommunication of the Rawāfiḍ due to them being innovators. But he has alluded that the dogma of the Rāfiḍah progresses and changes with the passage of time, that the later Shī‘ah are not like the early Shī‘ah, and also that the Rāfiḍah of his time are not the Rāfiḍah whom Imām al-Nawawī is talking about. Hence he makes the following comment upon the statement of Imām al-Nawawī:

قلت: وهذا في غير حق الرافضة الخارجة في زماننا فإنهم يعتقدون كفر أكثر الصحابة فضلا عن سائر أهل السنة الجماعة، فهم كفر بالإجماع بلا نزاع

I say that this is true regarding others besides the Rāfiḍah of our time; because they hold the belief that most of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم are disbelievers, let alone the rest of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Hence they (the Shī‘ah) are

1 Yahyā ibn Sharaf ibn Ḥasan ibn Ḥusayn al-Nawawī. Ibn Kathīr mentions that he was the leading scholar of the Shāfi‘ī School during his time and the supreme jurist. He passed away in 676 A.H. (*al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 3/278-279).

2 *Sharḥ al-Nawawī ‘alā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 2/50.

3 His biography will come ahead.

disbelievers according to the consensus of the Ummah without any dispute.¹

I would add that the evidence for the fact that the Twelvers of al-Nawawī's era did not excommunicate the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, or that he probably did not know of this belief which they hold (which is more likely given the fact that the narrations which excommunicate the Ṣaḥābah [ram] are found in their canonical works which existed before his time) is that Imām al-Nawawī has not mentioned in his commentary of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* that the Twelver Shī'ah excommunicate the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. Rather he has averred that excommunicating them is a belief exclusively held by the extremist Shī'ah.²

1 Mirqāt al-Mafātīḥ 9/137.

2 See: Sharḥ Muslim 15/173.

The Second Discussion

The Ruling regarding their Kufr

This is the view that majority of the great Muslim scholars have held throughout history, the likes of Imām Mālik, Aḥmad, al-Bukhārī, etc.

Hereunder I will present the exact quotations of the great scholars of Islam regarding the Rawāfiḍ who are otherwise known as the Twelvers and the Ja'fariyyah.¹

I will start with the mention of the Fatwā of Imām Mālik which I will follow up with the Fatwās of Imām Aḥmad and Imām Bukhārī. Thereafter I will present the Fatwās of the other scholars in accordance with their dates of death. I have chosen the Fatwās of only the eminent scholars of Islam, of scholars who lived with the Shī'ah in one town or those who studied their dogma and wrote regarding them from the scholars of the Muslims.

Imām Mālik

Al-Khallāl narrates from Abū Bakr al-Marwadhī that he said:

سمعت أبا عبد الله يقول قال مالك: الذي يشتم أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم ليس لهم اسم أو قال، نصيب في الإسلام

I heard Abū 'Abd Allah saying that Mālik said, "Those who curse the Companions of Nabī ﷺ² have no name or share in Islām."³

1 See p. 132, 136, and 138 of this book.

2 In the previous discussions which have passed on p. 972, onwards, that the Shī'ah consider it part of their Dīn to curse the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and excommunicate them, with the exception of individuals who barely amount to the amount of fingers on the hand.

3 Al-Khallāl: *al-Sunnah* 2/557. The annotator of the text says that the chain or transmission is authentic.

Ibn Kathīr mentions under the verse:

مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ مَعَهُ أَشِدَّاءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَاءُ بَيْنَهُمْ تَرَاهُمْ رُكَّعًا سُجَّدًا يَبْتَغُونَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَرِضْوَانًا سِيمَاهُمْ فِي وُجُوهِهِمْ مِّنْ أَثَرِ السُّجُودِ ذَلِكَ مَثَلُهُمْ فِي التَّوْرَةِ وَمَثَلُهُمْ فِي الْإِنْجِيلِ كَزَرْعٍ أَخْرَجَ شَطْأَهُ فَآزَرَهُ فَاسْتَغْلَظَ فَاسْتَوَىٰ عَلَىٰ سُوقِهِ يُعْجِبُ الزُّرَّاعَ لَيَغِيْظَ بِهِمُ الْكُفَّارَ

Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah; and those with him are forceful against the disbelievers, merciful among themselves. You see them bowing and prostrating [in prayer], seeking bounty from Allah and [His] pleasure. Their mark [i.e., sign] is on their faces [i.e., foreheads] from the trace of prostration. That is their description in the Torah. And their description in the Gospel is as a plant which produces its offshoots and strengthens them so they grow firm and stand upon their stalks, delighting the sowers – so that He [i.e., Allah] may enrage by them the disbelievers...¹

ومن هذه الآية انتزع الإمام مالك رحمه الله عليه في رواية عنه بتكفير الروافض الذين يبغضون الصحابة رضي الله عنهم، قال: لأنهم يغيظونهم ومن غاظ الصحابة رضي الله عنهم فهو كافر لهذه الآية، ووافقه طائفة من العلماء رضي الله عنهم على ذلك

Imām Mālik رحمته الله has deduced from this verse that the Rawāfiḍ who hate the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم are disbelievers, according one narration from him. He says, “Because they hate the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, and whoever hates the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم is a Kāfir because of this verse.” A group of scholars have agreed with him in this regard.²

Al-Qurtubī says:

لقد أحسن مالك في مقالته وأصاب في تأويله، فمن نقص واحدا منهم أو طعن عليه في روايته فقد رد على الله رب العالمين وأبطل شرائع الإسلام

Imām Mālik has made a profound statement and is indeed correct in his interpretation. Hence whoever denigrates any of them or criticises him in

1 Sūrah al-Faṭḥ: 29.

2 *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 4/219; *Rūḥ al-Ma‘ānī*: 26/116; *al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl* p. 579.

his narrations¹ has indeed rejected what Allah has said and has nullified the Sharī'ah of Islam.²

Imām Aḥmad

Several narrations have been narrated from him regarding their excommunication...

Al-Khallāl narrates from Abū Bakr al-Marwadhī:

سألت أبا عبد الله عن يثتم أبابكر وعمر وعائشة؟ قال: ما أراه على الإسلام

I asked Abū 'Abd Allah regarding a person who reviles Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Ā'ishah. He replied, "I don't see him to be on Islam."³

Al-Khallāl also says that 'Abd al-Mālīk ibn 'Abd al-Ḥamīd informed him:

من شتم أخاف عليه الكفر مثل الروافض، ثم قال: من شتم أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم لا نأمن أن يكون قد مرق من الدين

He who reviles, we fear disbelief upon him, like the Rawāfiḍ. He then said, "Whoever reviles the Companions of Nabī ﷺ we fear regarding him leaving the fold of Islam."⁴

He also says that 'Abd Allah ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal informed him that:

سألت أبي عن رجل شتم رجلا من أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فقال: ما أراه على الإسلام

1 The quote of one of the contemporary authorities regarding the narrations of Abū Hurayrah, 'Amr ibn al-Āṣ, and Samurah ibn Jundub not equating even to the wing of a mosquito has passed already on page no. 466.

2 *Tafsīr al-Qurṭubī* 16/297.

3 Al-Khallāl: *al-Sunnah* 2/557. The annotator says that the narration is authentic; also see: Ibn Baṭṭāh: *Sharḥ al-Sunnah* p. 161; *al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl* p. 571.

4 Al-Khallāl: *al-Sunnah* 2/558. The annotator of the book says that the narration is authentic.

I asked my father regarding a person who reviles an individual from the Ṣaḥābah of Nabī ﷺ. He replied, “I do not consider him to be upon Islam.”¹

Likewise the following appears in *Kitāb al-Sunnah* of Imām Aḥmad regarding the Rāfiḍah:

هم الذين يتبرأون من أصحاب النبي محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم يسبونهم وينتقصونهم ويكفرون الأئمة إلا أربعة: علي وعمار والمقداد وسلمان وليست الرافضة من الإسلام في شيء

They are the people who disassociate themselves from the Ṣaḥābah of Nabī Muḥammad ﷺ, revile them, and excommunicate all the leaders besides four: ‘Alī, ‘Ammār, Miqdād and Salmān. The Rāfiḍah have nothing to do with Islam.²

As has passed, the Twelvers excommunicate all the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ besides a few who do not amount to the fingers of the hand. They curse them in their prayers and their visitations of the shrines, holy sites, and in their canonical books. They also excommunicate all those who follow them till the Day of Judgment.³

Ibn ‘Abd al-Qawī mentions:

وكان الإمام أحمد يكفر من تبرأ منهم (أي الصحابة) ومن سب عائشة أم المؤمنين ورماها مما برأها الله منه وكان يقرأ يعظكم الله أن تعودوا لمثله أبداً إن كنتم مؤمنين

Imām Aḥmad would excommunicate any person who disassociated himself from the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ and reviled ‘Ā’ishah ﷺ, the Mother of the Believers, and accused her of what Allah has exonerated her from. He would often read the verse: Allah warns you against returning to the likes of this [conduct], ever, if you should be believers.⁴

1 Al-Khallāl: *al-Sunnah* 2/558. See: *Manāqib al-Imām Aḥmad* of Ibn al-Jawzī: p. 214.

2 Imām Aḥmad: *al-Sunnah* p. 82. With the annotations of Ismā‘īl al-Anṣārī.

3 See p. 972, onwards, of this book.

4 Verse no. 17 of Sūrah al-Nūr. This text appears in the book: Abū Muḥammad Rizq Allah ibn ‘Abd al-Qawī al-Tamīmī d. 480 A.H.: *Mā Yadhhab ilayh al-Imām Aḥmad* p. 21 (manuscript).

Ibn Taymiyyah has, however, mentioned in his *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā* that there is difference of opinion regarding the excommunication of the Rawāfiḍ reported from Imām Aḥmad and others.¹ But the citations from Imām Aḥmad that have passed are explicit regarding his excommunication of the Shī‘ah.

Ibn Taymiyyah has alluded to the reason why some scholars have not excommunicated those who revile the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم which maybe resolves the apparent contradiction in the statements of Imām Aḥmad:

وأما من سبهم سبا لا يقدح في عدالتهم ولا في دينهم مثل وصف بعضهم بالبخل أو الجبن أو قلة العلم أو عدم الزهد ونحو ذلك فهذا هو الذي يستحق التأديب والعزير، ولا نحكم بكفره بمجرد ذلك، وعلى هذا يحمل كلام من لم يكفرهم من أهل العلم

As for those who revile them in ways which do not tarnish their integrity and their Dīn, for example, by describing some of them with miserliness, cowardice, lack of knowledge and lack of disinclination from this world, etc., they deserve to be disciplined and punished. But we will not excommunicate them merely because of that. The statements of those who do not excommunicate them from the people of knowledge will be interpreted in this light.²

In other words those who revile them in ways that tarnish their integrity and Dīn will be considered a disbeliever according to the people of knowledge.

Al-Bukhārī (d. 256 A.H)

He says:

ما أبالي صليت خلف الجهمي والرافضي أم صليت خلف اليهود والنصارى، ولا يسلم عليهم ولا يعادون ولا يناكحون ولا يشهدون ولا تוכל ذبائحهم

1 *Al-Fatāwā* 3/352.

2 *Al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl* p. 586; also refer to p. 571 to see the explanation given by Abū Ya‘lā for the narrations of non-excommunication.

I do not bother whether I read Ṣalāh behind a Jahmī and a Rāfiḍī or behind the Jews and the Christians. They will not be greeted, they will not be visited, marriages cannot be contracted with them, they cannot testify and their slaughtered animals cannot be eaten.¹

‘Abd Allah ibn Idrīs²

He said:

ليس لرافضي شفعة إلا لمسلم

There is no right of Shuf‘ah³ for a Rāfiḍī but for a Muslim.⁴

‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī⁵

Al-Bukhārī says that ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī said:

هما ملتان الجهمية والرافضية

They are two distinct religions: the Jahmiyyah and the Rāfiḍiyyah.⁶

1 Al-Bukhārī: *Khalq Af‘āl al-‘Ibād* p. 125.

2 ‘Abd Allah ibn Idrīs ibn Yazīd ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Awdī. Abū Ḥātim said about him, “An authority who can be cited as evidence, a leader from the leader of the Muslims.” And Imām Aḥmad said, “He was unique.” Ibn Sa’d said, “He was reliable, trustworthy, a narrator of many narrations, an authority and an adherent of the Sunnah and the majority.” He passed away in 192 A.H. (See: *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 5/144-145; *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl* of Ibn Abī Ḥātim 5/8-9). He was from the prominent scholars of Kufah (*al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl* p. 570) and Kufah was the hub of Shī‘ism. He thus knew them and their dogma very well because every resident of the house knows better of its contents.

3 Right of buying the house for the neighbour.

4 Al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl p. 570; ‘Alī ‘Abd al-Kāfi al-Subkī: *al-Sayf al-Maslūl ‘alā man Sabb al-Rasūl* p. 71 (of the manuscript).

5 The great retainer of knowledge ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Mahdī ibn Ḥassān ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-‘Anbarī al-Baṣrī. Passed away in 197 A.H. (*Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 6/279-281).

6 *Khalq Af‘āl al-‘Ibād* p. 125; *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 35/415.

Al-Firyābī¹

Al-Khallāl has narrated:

أخبرني حرب بن إسماعيل الكرماني، قال: حدثنا موسى بن هارون بن زياد قال: سمعت الفريابي ورجل يسأله عن شتم أبى بكر قال: كافر، قال: فيصلى عليه، قال: لا. سألته كيف يصنع به وهو يقول لا إله إلا الله، قال: لا تمسوه بأيديكم ارفعوه بالخشب حتى تواروه في حفرة

Ḥarb ibn Ismā'īl al-Kirmānī informed me — Mūsā ibn Hārūn narrated to us, “I heard al-Firyābī saying when a person asked him regarding someone who reviles Abū Bakr, ‘He is a disbeliever.’ He further asked, “Will his funeral prayer be performed?” to which he replied, “No.” I then asked him what should be done with him when he professes that there is none worthy of worship besides Allah?” He replied, “Do not touch him with your hands, raise him with a stick till you cover him in a whole.”²

Aḥmad ibn Yūnus³

He said:

لو أن يهوديا ذبح شاة وذبح رافضي شاة لأكلت ذبيحة اليهودي ولم أكل ذبيحة الرافضي لأنه مرتد عن الإسلام

1 Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf al-Firyābī: Al-Bukhārī has narrated twenty six narrations from him. He was the most virtuous of people in his time. He passed away in 212 A.H. (*Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 9/535).

2 Al-Khallāl: *al-Sunnah* 2/577. The annotator of the book says, “In its transmission is Mūsā ibn Hārūn who I could not trace.”

3 Aḥmad ibn Yūnus ibn ‘Abd Allah, attributed to his grandfather. He is one of the Imāms of the Ahl al-Sunnah and is from Kufah the hub of Shī‘ism. Hence he would know them and their dogma better than anyone else. Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal said to a person, “Go to Aḥmad ibn Yūnus because he is the Shaykh of Islam.” The authors of the six canonical compilations have narrated from him. Abū Ḥātim says, “He was a reliable and proficient narrator.” Al-Nasā‘ī says, “He was reliable.” Ibn Sa’d says, “He was reliable, truthful and an adherent of the Sunnah and the majority.” Ibn Ḥajr has mentioned that Ibn Yunus said, “I came to Ḥammād ibn Zayd and asked him to dictate to me some of the merits of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. He asked, “Who are you?” I told him that I am from Kufah. He thus said, “A Kufī seeking the merits of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه! By Allah I will not dictate them to you except that I will stand and you will sit.” He passed away in 227 A.H. (*Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 1/50; *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb* 1/29).

If a Jew slaughters an animal and a Shīʿī slaughters an animal, I would rather eat the slaughtered animal of the Jew and not eat the slaughtered animal of the Shīʿī, because he is an apostate.¹

Abū Zurʿah al-Rāzī²

He said:

إذا رأيت الرجل ينتقص أحدا من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فاعلم أنه زنديق، لأن مؤدى قوله إلى إبطال القرآن والسنة

If you see a person denigrating any of the Companions of Nabī ﷺ then know that he is a heretic, because the implication of his statement is rendering the Qurʾān and the Sunnah false.³

Ibn Qutaybah⁴

He said:

بأن غلو الرافضة في حب علي المتمثل في تقديمه على من قدمه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وصحابته عليه، وادعائهم له شركة النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم في نبوته، وعلم الغيب للأئمة من ولده وتلك الأقاويل والأمر السرية قد جمعت إلى الكذب والكفر أفرط الجهل والغباوة

The fanaticism of the Rāfiḍah in the love of ʿAlī which is represented in giving him preference over those to whom Rasūl Allah ﷺ and his

1 *Al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl* p. 570. The same is reported from Abū Bakr ibn Hānī (ibid); also see: *al-Sayf al-Maslūl ʿalā man Sabb al-Rasūl* page no. 71 (manuscript).

2 ʿAbd Allah ibn ʿAbd al-Karīm ibn Yazīd ibn Farrūkh al-Makhzūmī (by way of the contract of Walāʾ, clientage) al-Rāzī. One of the great scholars of ḥadīth and eminent scholars. He knew a million ḥadīth and thus it used to be said that any ḥadīth which Abū Zurʿah does not know has no basis. He passed away in 264 A.H.

3 *Al-Kifāyah* p. 49. The entire text has passed on p. 1041.

4 Abū Muḥammad ʿAbd Allah ibn Muslim ibn Qutaybah al-Dīnawārī, the author of sterling books which consist of immense knowledge, as described by Ibn Kathīr. He passed away in 276 A.H. (*Wafayāt al-Aʿyān* 2/42-44; *Tārīkh Baghdād* 10/170-171; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/48).

Companions gave preference, their claim that he shared prophethood with Nabī ﷺ, their claim that knowledge of the unseen was accorded to the Imāms of his progeny, and all those other eerie views and clandestine matters, have gathered ignorance and foolishness coupled with lies and Kufr, disbelief.¹

‘Abd al-Qāhir al-Baghdādī²

He said:

وأما أهل الأهواء من الجارودية والهشامية والجهمية والإمامية الذين أكفروا خيار الصحابة... فإننا نكفروها ولا تجوز الصلاة عليهم عندنا ولا الصلاة خلفهم

As for the heretics, i.e. the Jārūdiyyah, the Hishāmiyyah, the Jahmiyyah and the Imāmiyyah who excommunicate the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ, we excommunicate them. It is not permissible to perform their funeral prayers nor is it permissible to read Ṣalāh behind them.³

He also says:

وتكفير هؤلاء واجب في إجازتهم على الله البدء، وقولهم بأنه قد يريد شيئاً ثم يبدو له، وقد زعموا أنه إذا أمر بشيء ثم نسخه فإنما نسخه لأنه بدا له فيه. وما رأينا ولا سمعنا بنوع من الكفر إلا وجدنا شعبة منه في مذهب الرافضة

Excommunicating these people is compulsory because of their belief of Badā’, i.e. their belief that he at times can intend something and subsequently otherwise can occur to him; they claim that when he issues

1 *Al-Ikhtilāf fī al-Lafẓ wa al-Radd ‘alā al-Jahmiyyah wa al-Mushabbihah* (published by Maṭba‘ah al-Sa‘ādah in Egypt in the year 1349 A.H.) p.47.

2 ‘Abd al-Qāhir ibn Ṭāhir ibn Muḥammad al-Baghdādī al-Tamīmī al-Isfarā‘īnī Abū Manṣūr. He was accorded the title Ṣadr al-Islām, the heart of Islam, during his time. He would teach seventeen different sciences. He passed away in 429 A.H. (al-Subkī: *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyyah* 5/136-145; al-Qifṭī: *Imbāh al-Ruwāt* 2/185, 86; al-Suyūṭī: *Bughyah al-Wu‘āh* 2/105).

3 *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* p. 357.

an order regarding something and thereafter abrogates it he abrogates it because otherwise occurred to him. We have not seen or heard of any type of disbelief but that we have found a portion of it in the dogma of the Rāfiḍah.¹

Qāḍī Abū Ya‘lā²

He said:

وأما الرافضة فالحكم فيهم... إن كفر الصحابة أو فسقهم بمعنى يستوجب به النار فهو كافر

As for the Rāfiḍah, the ruling regarding them... is that if he excommunicates the Ṣaḥābah or impugns them in a way that necessitates Hell-fire; he is a disbeliever.³

Ibn Ḥazm

He said:

وأما قولهم (يعني النصارى) في دعوى الروافض بتدليل القرآن فإن الروافض ليسوا من المسلمين، إنما هي فرقة حدث أولها بعد موت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بخمس وعشرين سنة... وهي طائفة تجري مجرى اليهود والنصارى في الكذب والكفر

As for their claim (the Christians) regarding the belief of the Rāfiḍah regarding the distortion of the Qur’ān, the Rawāfiḍ are not Muslims; their spearheaders emerged twenty five years after the demise of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. They are a sect like the Jews and the Christians in falsehood and disbelief.⁴

1 *Al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* p. 52-53.

2 Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn Khalaf ibn al-Farrā’ Abū Ya‘lā. The eminent scholar of his time in the principles of Sharī‘ah and the secondary matters thereof. He passed away in 458 A.H.

3 *Al-Mu‘tamad* p. 267.

4 *Al-Faṣl* 2/213.

He also says:

ومن قول الإمامية قديما وحديثا أن القرآن مبديل

The Imāmiyyah in the past and present aver that the Qur'ān is distorted.¹

Thereafter he says:

القول بأن بين اللوحين تبديلا كفر صريح وتكذيب لرسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

The view that distortion occurred between the two covers is emphatic disbelief and a refutation of Rasūl Allah ﷺ.²

He also says:

ولا خلاف بين أحد من الفرق المنتمية إلى المسلمين من أهل السنة والمعتزلة والخوارج والمرجئة والزيدية في وجوب الأخذ بما في القرآن وأنه المتلو عندنا... وإنما خالف في ذلك قوم من غلاة الروافض وهم كفار بذلك مشركون عند جميع أهل الإسلام وليس كلامنا مع هؤلاء وإنما كلامنا مع أهل ملتنا

There is no dispute between the various subjects which subscribe to Islam, viz. the Ahl al-Sunnah, the Mu'tazilah, the Khawārij, the Murji'ah and the Zaydiyyah that it is compulsory to latch onto whatever is in the Qur'ān and that it will be recited. Only the extremist Rawāfiḍ have differed in this regard. But they are disbelievers and polytheist according to all the Muslims and hence our discussion is not with these people, it is rather with the people of our religion.³

He also says:

واعلموا أن رسول الله لم يكتف من الشريعة كلمة فما فوقها، ولا أطلع أخص الناس به من ابنة أو ابن عم أو زوجة أو صاحب على شيء من الشريعة كتمه عن الأحمر والأسود ورعاة الغنم، ولا كان عنده عليه

1 Al-Faṣl 5/40.

2 He has excluded three individuals from them, as has passed.

3 Al-Iḥkām fī Uṣūl al-Aḥkām 1/96.

السلام سر ولا رمز ولا باطن غير ما دعا الناس كلهم إليه، فلو كتمهم شيئاً لما بلغ كما أمر، ومن قال هذا فهو كافر

Know well that Rasūl Allah ﷺ has not concealed a word or even less of the Sharī'ah, nor did he impart to the closest of people to him, his daughter, son-in-law, wife or any other Companion for that matter, any aspect of the Sharī'ah which he concealed from the red skinned, the black-skinned, and the shepherds. He likewise did not have any secret, sign or esoteric knowledge other than what he invited the people to. Had he concealed anything from them he would have failed to convey as he was ordered to. And whoever says this is a disbeliever...¹

Al-Isfarā'īnī²

After citing various beliefs of the Rawāfiḍ, like the excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah, the interpolation of the Qur'ān, and their anticipation of the advent of the Mahdī who will come out to them and teach them Sharī'ah and thereafter asserting that all the sects of the Imāmiyyah unanimously believe in all these beliefs; he says:

وليسوا في الحال على شيء من الدين، ولا مزيد على هذا النوع من الكفر إذ لا بقاء فيه على شيء من الدين

At the moment they are not upon anything of Dīn. And there is no extent of disbelief which is worse than this type of disbelief, for with it there is no remaining upon Dīn whatsoever.³

1 *Al-Faṣl* 2/274-275. This belief based on which Ibn Ḥazm is excommunicating the one who holds it has become one of the principle beliefs of the Twelvers; their contemporary and ancient scholars assert this in their books. (See: p. 425 of this book).

2 Abū al-Muẓaffar Shahfūr ibn Ṭāhir ibn Muḥammad al-Isfarā'īnī. The great jurist, exegete and master of the principles of Sharī'ah. He has written several books, two among them being *al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr* and *al-Tabṣīr fī al-Dīn*. He passed away in 471 A.H.

3 *Al-Tabṣīr fī al-Dīn* p. 24-25.

Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī¹

ولأجل قصور فهم الروافض عنه ارتكبوا البداء ونقلوا عن علي رضي الله عنه أنه كان لا يخبر عن الغيب مخافة أن يبدو له تعالى فيه فيغيره. وحكوا عن جعفر بن محمد أنه قال: ما بدا لله في شيء كما بدا له في إسماعيل أي في أمره بذبحه... وهذا هو الكفر الصريح، ونسبة الإله تعالى إلى الجهل والتغير ويدل على استحالة ما دل على أنه محيط بكل شيء علما

Due to the Rawāfiḍ not being able to fully grasp this concept² they invented the idea of *Badā'*. Hence they narrate from 'Alī عليه السلام that he would not give information regarding the matters of the unseen due to the fear that otherwise could occur to Allah due to which he would change a particular matter.³ Likewise they have narrated from Ja'far ibn Muḥammad that he said, "In nothing has otherwise occurred to Allah as it occurred to him regarding Ismā'īl, i.e. his order to slaughter him..."⁴ This is outright

1 Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Ṭūsī al-Ghazālī. Ibn Kathīr has said, "One of the masters of this world in any topic that is discussed. He has extensive works on various subjects. From his books are *Faḍā'il al-Bāṭiniyyah*. He passed away in 505 A.H. (*al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 12/173-174; *Mir'āt al-Jinān* 3/177-192).

2 The person who studies the doctrine of *Badā'* according to the Rāfiḍah will realise that it is not a result of their lack of understanding, but that it is a well-established position to which their fanaticism regarding their Imāms have driven them. This statement of al-Ghazālī is similar to the statement of al-Āmidī in *Iḥkām* 3/109 wherein he says, "The difference between *Naskh*, abrogation, and *Badā'* was unclear to the Rāfiḍah."

Commenting upon this, Shaykh 'Abd al-Razzāq al-'Affī says, "Whoever knows the reality of the Rāfiḍah, is aware of their innovations and heretical nature of hiding disbelief and displaying Islam, is aware of the fact that they inherited their principles from the Jews and that they tread their path in plotting against Islam, will know that whatever lies they have contrived and espoused in the belief of *Badā'* were all due to sinister motives and hate for the truth and its people; they are a sect driven by the passion to infuse falsehood, deceive and deploy the hammers of destruction secretly and openly to destroy the Sharī'ah and all those countries which are governed by it. (*Al-Iḥkām fī Uṣūl al-Aḥkām* 3/109-110: footnotes).

3 This narration is found in the *Biḥār* of al-Majlisī (with reference to the book *Qurb al-Isnād*) 4/97. In another narration they attribute this statement to 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn (*Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī* 2/215; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 4/118; *al-Burhān* 2/299; *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* 3/75).

4 See this narration in *Kitāb al-Tawḥīd* of Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī p. 336.

disbelief and attribution of ignorance and change to Allah ﷻ. The impossibility of this is clearly indicated in the verse which states that he has encompassed everything in terms of knowledge.¹

He likewise says:

فلو صرح مصرح بكفر أبي بكر وعمر رضي الله عنهما فقد خالف الإجماع وخرقه، ورد ما جاء في حقهم من الوعد بالجنة والثناء عليهم والحكم بصحة دينهم وثبات يقينهم وتقديمهم على سائر الخلق في أخبار كثيرة... فقاتل ذلك إن بلغت الأخبار واعتقد مع ذلك كفرهم فهو كافر. بتكذيبه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فمن كذبه بكلمة من أقاويله فهو كافر بالإجماع

If someone unambiguously asserts the disbelief of Abū Bakr and 'Umar رضي الله عنهما, then he has indeed violated the consensus of the Ummah and opposed it. He has rejected all the merits that have been reported regarding them deserving Jannah, regarding their praises, the validity of their Dīn, the firmness of their faith and their excellence over the rest of the creation, amidst other narrations. Hence if the narrations reach a person who holds this view and despite that he still avers that they are disbelievers, then he is a disbeliever due to him belying Rasūl Allah ﷺ; any person who belies even a word of the statements of Rasūl Allah ﷺ is a disbeliever according to the consensus of the Ummah.²

Qāḍī 'Ayāḍ³

He said:

نقطع بتكفير غلاة الرافضة في قولهم إن الأئمة أفضل من الأنبياء

1 Al-Mustaṣḥā 1/110.

2 Faḍā'iḥ al-Bāṭiniyyah p. 149.

3 'Ayāḍ ibn Mūsā ibn 'Ayāḍ ibn 'Amr al-Yaḥṣubī. The prominent scholar of the Andalusia and the leader of the ḥadīth scholars of his time. He passed away in 544 A.H. (Wafayāt al-A'yān 3/483; al-Dhahabī: al-Ibar 2/467; al-Ḍabbī: Bughyah al-Multamīs p. 437; al-Nabāhī: Tārīkh Quḍāt Andalus p. 101).

We definitively excommunicate the extremist Rāfiḍah who aver that the Imāms are better than the Ambiyā'.¹

He also says:

وكذلك يحكم بكفر من قال: بمشاركة علي في الرسالة للنبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وبعده، وأن كل إمام يقوم مقام النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم في النبوة والحجة، وأشار بأن هذا مذهب أكثر الرافضة. وكذلك من ادعى منهم أنه يوحى إليه وإن لم يدع النبوة

وقال: وكذلك نكفر من أنكر القرآن أو حرفا منه، أو غير شيئا منه أو زاد فيه كفعل الباطنية والإسماعيلية

Likewise the ruling of excommunication will be issued regarding a person who says that 'Alī shared prophethood with Nabī ﷺ and (enjoys prophethood) after him as well, and that every Imām is equal to Nabī ﷺ in prophethood and authority (he has indicated that this is the viewpoint

1 See p. 837 of this book. The contemporary Shī'ah consider this doctrine which is steeped in disbelief to be one of the categorically established aspects of their dogma, of which a denier is considered to be disbeliever according to them (See: p. 1481 of this book).

Their scholar al-Mamiqānī says:

ومن ضروريات مذهبنا أن الأئمة عليهم السلام أفضل من أنبياء بني إسرائيل كما نطقت بذلك النصوص المتواترة... ولا شبهة عند كل ممارس لأخبار أهل البيت عليهم السلام (يعني أئمتهم الإثني عشر) أنه كان يصدر من الأئمة عليهم السلام خوارق للعادة نظير ما كان يصدر من الأنبياء بل أزيد، وأن الأنبياء والسلف انفتحت باب أو بابان من العلم وانفتحت للأئمة عليهم السلام بسبب العبادة والطاعة التي تذر العبد مثل الله إذا قال لشيء كن فيكون جميع الأبواب

From the categorically established aspects of our dogma is that the Imāms ﷺ are more virtuous than the Ambiyā' of Banī Isrā'īl, as is diffusely narrated in the narrations. For a person who studies the narrations of the Ahl al-Bayt ﷺ there remains no doubt that supernatural phenomena like those which would come forth at the hands of the Ambiyā' would occur for the Imāms, in fact even more; also that for the Ambiyā' and the pious predecessors only one or two doors of worship would open, whereas for the Imāms, due to their worship and diligence, such doors opened which leave a servant like Allah in that when he says to something be, it becomes. Hence that would mean all the doors. (*Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl* 3/232.)

See how initially their virtue is equivalent to that of the Ambiyā' and however thereafter it ends with them being like Allah ﷻ. Pure is Allah from what the transgressors say.

of most of the Rāfiḍah).¹ Likewise a person who claims that revelation is sent to him will also be excommunicated even though he does not claim Nubuwwah.²

We also excommunicate anyone who rejects the Qur’ān or even a letter thereof, distorts anything therein or adds to it, as is the doings of the Bāṭiniyyah and the Ismā’īliyyah.³

Al-Sam‘ānī⁴

He has said:

واجتمعت الأمة على تكفير الإمامية، لأنهم يعتقدون تضليل الصحابة وينكرون إجماعهم وينسبونهاهم
إلى ما يليق بهم

The Ummah has concurred upon the excommunication of the Imāmiyyah; because they believe in the deviance of the Ṣaḥābah, deny their consensus, and attribute to them what fits their (the Shī‘ah) profile.^{5,6}

1 The Twelvers assert that the Imāmah is higher than Nubuwwah in rank (see p. 891 of this book). Likewise they assert that the Imām is the evidence of Allah against the people just like the Ambiyā’ (see p. 849 of this book).

2 This is what the Rawāfiḍ claim. See p. 418, onwards.

3 It is important to note that although some scholars attribute the view of the interpolation of the Qur’ān to the Ismā’īliyyah, but it is the view of the Twelvers. The Ismā’īliyyah have merely adopted the position of esoteric interpretation.

4 The Imām, the preserver and great scholar of ḥadīth Abū Sa’d ‘Abd al-Karīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Maṣṣūr al-Tamīmī al-Sam‘ānī. The author of the book *al-Ansāb* amongst others. He travelled and studied ḥadīth under four thousand scholars. Ibn Kathīr mentions, “Ibn Khallikān has mentioned several of his books, amongst them is a book wherein he compiled a thousand narrations from a hundred scholars and analysed them in terms of their chains of transmission and their wordings, a very beneficial book indeed.” He passed away in 562 A.H. (*Wafayāt al-A’yān* 3/209; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 12/175).

5 إلى ما يليق بهم This is how the text appears in the actual book. If the pronoun is referring to the Shī‘ah, then it is correct; because it would then translate as ‘they attribute to the Ṣaḥābah that which is only characteristic of them. But if the pronoun is referring to the Ṣaḥābah, then probably there is a mistake and the more accurate sentence would be إلى ما لا يليق بهم (that which not behoving of them).

6 *Al-Ansāb* 6/341.

Al-Rāzī¹

Al-Rāzī states that the Ashā'irah excommunicate the Rawāfiḍ for three reasons:

أولها: أنهم كفروا سادات المسلمين، وكل من كفر مسلما فهو كافر لقوله عليه السلام: من قال لأخيه يا كافر فقد باء به أحدهما. فإذاً يجب تكفيرهم

وثانيها: أنهم كفروا قوما نص الرسول عليه السلام بالثناء عليهم وتعظيم شأنهم، فيكون تكفيرهم تكذيبا للرسول عليه السلام

وثالثها: إجماع الأمة على تكفير من كفر سادات الصحابة

Firstly, because they excommunicate eminent figures of the Muslims, and any person who excommunicates a Muslim is a disbeliever due to the ḥadīth of Nabī ﷺ, “Whoever tells his brother, *O Kāfir*, then one of them will return with it.”² Hence it is compulsory to excommunicate them.

Secondly, because they excommunicate a people whom Rasūl Allah ﷺ has emphatically praised and extolled. Their excommunication (of these people) thus is a refutation of Rasūl Allah ﷺ.

Thirdly, the consensus of the Ummah upon the excommunication of all those who excommunicate the noble Ṣaḥābah.³

Ibn Taymiyyah

He says:

من زعم أن القرآن نقص منه آيات وكنمت، أو زعم أن له تأويلات باطنة تسقط الأعمال المشروعة، فلا خلاف في كفرهم. ومن زعم أن الصحابة ارتدوا بعد رسول الله عليه الصلاة والسلام فهذا لا ريب أيضا في كفره، لأنه مكذب لما نصه القرآن في غير موضع من الرضى عنهم والثناء عليهم. بل من يشك في كفر

1 Muḥammad ibn 'Umar ibn al-Ḥusayn, also well known as 'al-Fakhr al-Rāzī. He was an exegete, a theologian, a jurist and a master in the principles of Fiqh. He wrote *al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr*, *al-Maḥṣūl*, etc. a light extent of Shiasm is attributed to him. He passed away in 606 A.H. (*Lisān al-Mīzān* 4/426; al-Suyūṭī: *Ṭabaqāt al-Mufasssīrīn* p. 115; 'Uyūn al-Anbā' p. 414-427).

2 The reference will come ahead.

3 Al-Rāzī: *Nihāyah al-'Uqūl* (manuscript) p. 212.

مثل هذا فإن كفره متعين، فإن مضمون هذه المقالة أن نقلة الكتاب والسنة كفارا أو فساق، وإن هذه الآية التي هي كُنتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ وخيرها هو القرن الأول، كان عامتهم كفارا أو فساقا، ومضمونها أن هذه الأمة شر الأمم وأن سابقي هذه الأمة هم شرارها وكفر هذا مما يعلم بالإضطراب من دين الإسلام.

He who claims that verses of the Qur'ān were omitted or concealed, or claims that they have esoteric interpretations which drop all Sharī obligations, there is no doubt regarding their disbelief. Likewise, he who claims that the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم apostatised after Rasūl Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, there is no doubt regarding his disbelief as well; because he is thereby refuting the praises and the announcements of pleasure emphatically stated regarding them in the Qur'ān in several places. In fact a person who doubts the disbelief of such a person his disbelief is definite. This is because this view implies that the transmitters of Qur'ān and the Sunnah were either disbelievers or imposters; the verse, '*you are the best of nations taken out for the benefit of men*'¹ suggests that the best thereof was the first generation, but (according to this view) majority of them were either disbelievers or imposters, which implies that this Ummah is the worst of nations and that the first generation therein are the worst among them. The disbelief contained therein is obvious in the Dīn of Islam.²

He also says:

إنهم شر من عامة أهل الأهواء، وأحق بالقتال من الخوارج

They are worse than most of the heterodoxies and more deserving of being combatted than even the Khawārij.³

Thereafter he says that they have disbelieved in what Rasūl Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم came with in ways which are innumerable but by Allāh.

At times they belie the traditions which are authentically reported from him and at times they deny the meanings and implications of the Qur'ān.

1 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 110.

2 Al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl p. 586-587.

3 Majmū' Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 28/482.

This is so because of the following:

- » Allah has mentioned the praises of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ in the Qur'ān, the glad tidings of being pleased with them, and the exhortation to seek forgiveness for them, all of which the Rawāfiḍ don't believe.
- » He has enjoined upon us in His Book the establishing of Jumu'ah, Jihād, and loyalty to the rulers; which the Shī'ah are completely away from.
- » He has emphasised in His Book the importance of associating with the believers, loving them, and striving to bring about unity among them; which they do not do.
- » He has likewise emphasised the prohibition of associating with the disbelievers and loving them; which they do not uphold.
- » He has made forbidden in His Book the blood of Muslims, their wealth, their integrity, backbiting, taunting, and denigrating; all of which the Shī'ah violate and consider permissible.
- » He has exhorted us in His Book to hold on to the majority and live with mutual love and has forbade us from disunity and sectarianism; from which the Shī'ah are the furthest of people.
- » He has mentioned in His Book the importance of obeying Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, loving him, and carrying his orders; which they are very distant from.
- » He has mentioned in His Book the rights of the wives of Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ which the Shī'ah consider themselves exempted from.
- » He has emphasised in His Book monotheism, acknowledging his dominion alone, and worshipping him alone; which the Shī'ah are away from due to them being the most extreme in their veneration of graves which they have taken as deities besides Allah.
- » He has informed of His names and attributes; which they do not believe in.

» And lastly, He has also mentioned that He is capable of doing everything, that He is the Creator of everything, that only that which He wants will happen, and that there is no strength but from Allah; all of which they disbelieve in.

Ibn Taymiyyah then says:

ومن اعتقد من المنتسبين إلى العلم أو غيره أن قتال هؤلاء بمنزلة قتال البغاة الخارجين على الإمام بتأويل سائغ... فهو غلط جاهل بحقيقة شريعة الإسلام... لأن هؤلاء خارجون عن نفس شريعة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وستة شرا من خروج الخوارج الحنابلة، وليس لهم تأويل سائغ، فإن تأويل السائغ هو الجائر الذي يقر صاحبه عليه إذا لم يكن فيه جواب كتأويل العلماء المنتازعين في موارد الاجتهاد. وهؤلاء ليس لهم ذلك بالكتاب والسنة والإجماع، ولكن لهم تأويل من جنس تأويل اليهود والنصارى، وتأويلهم شر تأويلات أهل الأهواء.

Whoever from the people of knowledge avers that fighting these people is just like fighting those who rebel against the ruler due to an allowable interpretation, is indeed mistaken and ignorant of the Sharī'ah of Islām; because these people have departed from the Sharī'ah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and his Sunnah in ways which are more reprehensible than the departure of the Khawārij; they have no allowable interpretation.¹ An allowable interpretation is one which is inherently permissible and the proponent thereof is left (to act upon it) if there is no counterargument. But these people do not have any such interpretations, as can be established from the Qur'ān, the Sunnah, and the consensus of the Ummah; their interpretations are like the interpretations of the Jews and the Christians and are the worst of interpretations propounded by the heterodox sects.²

However, although Ibn Taymiyyah excommunicates the bearers of these views, but his excommunication of a specific individual is dependent upon the establishment of evidence and the reaching of the message. Hence he gave the following Fatwā when the Muslims captured the Shī'ah in Shām:

1 *Al-Fatāwā* 28/484-485

2 *Al-Fatāwā* 28/486.

وقد علم أنه كان بساحل الشام جبل كبير فيه ألوف من الرافضة يسفكون دماء الناس ويأخذون أموالهم، وقتلوا خلقا عظيما وأخذوا أموالهم ولما انكسر المسلمون سنة غازان أخذوا الخيل والسلاح والأسارى وباعوهم للكفار والنصارى بقرص، وأخذوا من مر بهم من الجند وكانوا أضر على المسلمين من جميع الأعداء، وحمل بعض أمرائهم راية النصارى، وقالوا له: إما خير المسلمون أو النصارى؟ فقال: بل النصارى، فقالوا له: مع من تحشر يوم القيامة؟ فقال: مع النصارى وسلموا إليهم بعض بلاد المسلمين

ومع هذا فلما استشار بعض ولاة الأمر في غزوهم وكتبت جوابا مبسوطا في غزوهم... وذهبنا إلى ناحيتهم، وحضر عندي جماعة منهم وجرت بيني وبينهم مناظرات ومفاوضات يطول وصفها، فلما فتح المسلمون بلادهم، وتمكن المسلمون منهم نهيتهم عن قتلهم، وعن سبيهم وأنزلناهم في بلاد المسلمين متفرقين لئلا يجتمعوا

It is well-established that at the seaside of Shām there was a big mountain which was inhabited by thousands of Rāfiḍah who went about shedding the blood of people and usurping their wealth; they killed a great amount of people and took their belongings. When the Muslims were defeated in the year of Ghāzān¹ they took the horses, weaponry, and prisoners and sold them to the disbelievers and the Christians in Cyprus. They also took whoever of the Muslims passed by them from the army and proved more harmful for the Muslims than all other enemies. One of their leaders even went to the extent of carrying the flag of the Christians who asked him, “Who is better, the Muslims or the Christians? To which he replied, “The Christians.” They thereafter asked, “With whom will you be raised on the Day of Judgment? He said, “With the Christians.” They handed over to them the lands of the Muslims.

Despite all of this when one of the governors consulted me regarding waging war against them, I wrote a detailed answer regarding fighting them...² Subsequently we went to them and a group of their scholars visited me and debates and negotiations took place, which is too much to describe. And when the Muslims conquered their town and the Muslims had full control over them I prevented them from killing them and taking them as captives. Hence we made them settle in various parts of the Muslim lands so that they are not able to reunite.³

1 See p. 1595 of this book. (Footnote 3)

2 Probably it appears in his *Fatāwā* 28/398.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/39.

This Fatwā of a leading scholar of the Ahl al-Sunnah in his time reveals that the Ahl al-Sunnah follow the truth which Rasūl Allah ﷺ brought to them from his lord. They do not excommunicate everyone who opposes them, rather they know the truth better and are more merciful to the bondsmen. As opposed to the various heterodoxies who invent views and ideas and excommunicate anyone who opposes them in those ideas.¹

Ibn Kathīr²

After citing a few narrations which are well-established in the Sunnah and which entail a refutation of *Naṣṣ* (emphatic appointment), *Waṣīyyah* (bequest), which the Shī'ah claim for 'Alī رضي الله عنه he mentions the following:

ولو كان الأمر كما زعموا لما رد ذلك أحد من الصحابة فإنهم كانوا أطوع لله ولرسوله في حياته وبعد وفاته، من أن يفتاتوا عليه فيقدموا غير من قدمه، ويؤخروا من قدمه بنصه، حاشا وكلا. ومن ظن بالصحابة رضوان الله عليهم ذلك فقد نسبهم بإجماعهم إلى الفجور، والتواطؤ على معاندة الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم ومضادتهم في حكمه ونصه، ومن وصل من الناس إلى هذا المقام فقد خلع ربة الإسلام وكفر بإجماع الأئمة الإعلام، وكان إراقة دمه أحل من إراقة المدام.

Had the matter been as they claim, none of the Ṣaḥābah would reject that; because they were more obedient to Allah and his Rasūl Allah ﷺ, during his lifetime and after his demise, than would invent lies against him and push forth a person other than the one whom he put forward with his emphatic appointment. This is never possible. Whoever thinks of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم in this way has indeed tainted all of them with transgression, agreeing upon opposing Rasūl Allah ﷺ and contradicting him in his orders and emphatic appointment. And hence whoever reaches this extent has indeed renounced his allegiance to Islam and is a disbeliever according

1 Ibid.

2 The Imām, ḥadīth scholar and expert Muftī, as described by al-Dhahabī. Abū al-Fidā' Ismā'īl ibn 'Umar ibn Kathīr. Al-Shawkānī has said, "He has written many beneficial books, among them is his work on Qur'ānic exegesis which is from the best of works if not the best itself. He passed away in 774 A.H. (Ibn Ḥajr: *al-Durar al-Kāminah* 1/373-374; al-Shawkānī: *al-Badr al-Ṭālī* 1/153).

to the consensus of the eminent scholars, owing to which shedding his blood is more admissible than the spilling of wine.¹

It has passed already that the Rāfiḍah claim that Rasūl Allah ﷺ emphatically nominated 'Alī and that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ rejected that appointment as a result of which they apostatised. This is unanimously propounded by their ancient and contemporary scholars.²

Abū Ḥāmid Muḥammad al-Maqdisī³

After discussing the various sects of the Shī'ah and their beliefs he concludes:

لا يخفى على كل ذي بصيرة وفهم من المسلمين أن أكثر ما قدمناه في الباب قبله من عقائد هذه الطائفة
الرافضة على اختلاف اصنافها كفر صريح، وعناد مع جهل قبيح لا يتوقف الواقف عليه من تكفيرهم
والحكم عليهم بالمروق من دين الإسلام

It is not unclear to any person of insight and understanding from amongst the Muslims that most of what we presented in the previous chapter regarding the beliefs of this Rāfiḍah cult, with all the variances, is open disbelief, obstinateness, and despicable ignorance. A person who comes to learn of them will not hesitate in excommunicating them and issuing a ruling of them departing from the Dīn of Islam.⁴

Abū al-Maḥāsīn Yūsuf al-Wāsiṭī⁵

He mentions a few reasons why they should be excommunicated. Amongst them are the following:

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 5/252.

2 See p. 972 and p. 1460 of this book.

3 Muḥammad ibn Khalīl ibn Yūsuf al-Ramalī al-Maqdisī. From the Jurists of the Shāfi'īs. He passed away in 888 A.H. (*al-Sakhāwī: al-Ḍaw' al-Lāmi'* 7/234; *al-Badr al-Ṭāli'* 2/169).

4 *Risālah fī al-Radd 'alā al-Rāfiḍah* p. 200.

5 Yūsuf al-Jamāl Abū al-Maḥāsīn al-Wāsiṭī. A scholar of the ninth century. (*Al-Ḍaw' al-Lāmi'* 10/338-339).

إنهم يكفرون بتكفيرهم لصحابة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم الثابت تعديلهم وتركيتهم في القرآن بقوله تعالى: لَتَكُونُنَّ أَشْهَادًا عَلَى النَّاسِ وبشهادة الله تعالى لهم أنهم لا يكفرون بقوله تعالى: فَإِنْ يَكْفُرْ بِهَا هَؤُلَاءِ فَقَدْ وَكَلْنَا بِهَا قَوْمًا لَيَكْفُرُنَّ بِهَا بِكَفَرَيْنَ.

ويكفرون باستغنائهم عن حج بيت الله الحرام بزيارة قبر الحسين لزعمتهم أنها تغفر الذنوب وتسميتهم لها الحج الأكبر، ومن ذلك أنهم يكفرون بترك جهاد الكفار والغزو لهم الذي يزعمون أنه لا يجوز إلا مع الإمام المعصوم وهو غائب.

وأنهم يكفرون بإعابتهم السنن المتواتر فعلها عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم من الجماعة والضحي والوتر والرواتب قبل المكتوبات من الصلوات الخمس وبعدها، وغير ذلك من السنن المؤكدات.

They are to be excommunicated due to them excommunicating the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ whose integrity is established in the Qur'ān in the verse 'so that you may be witnesses upon the people'¹ and by the testimony of Allah ﷻ that they are not disbelievers in the verse 'But if they [i.e., the disbelievers] deny it, then We have entrusted it to a people who are not therein disbelievers.'²

They are likewise to be excommunicated on the basis that they display independence from doing Ḥajj to the House of Allah ﷻ due to replacing it with visiting the grave of Ḥusayn, which according to them is a source of forgiveness of sins and which they deem the *al-Ḥajj al-Akbar*, the great Ḥajj.

They will also be excommunicated due to them leaving Jihād against the enemy and waging war against them which according to them is not permissible but with an infallible Imām who is absent.³

Similarly they will be excommunicated due to them criticising the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ which are diffusely transmitted from him, for example adherence to congregational prayer, prayer of forenoon, emphasised Sunnah prayers which are to be performed before the five Ṣalāhs and after them, amongst other emphasised Sunnahs.⁴

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 143.

2 Sūrah al-An'ām: 89.

3 *Al-Munāẓarah Bayn Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Rāfiḍah* (manuscript) p. 66.

4 Ibid. p. 67.

‘Alī ibn Sulṭān al-Qārī¹

He says:

وأما من سب أحدا من الصحابة فهو فاسق ومبتدع بالإجماع إلا إذا اعتقد أنه مباح كما عليه الشيعة وأصحابهم أو يترتب عليه ثواب كما هو دأب كلامهم أو اعتقد كفر الصحابة وأهل السنة فإنه كافر بالإجماع

As for the one who swears any of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنه he is a sinner and an innovator according to the consensus of the Ummah, unless he considers doing so to be permissible, as is the view of the Shī‘ah and their ilk, deems it to be yielding of reward, or believes in the disbelief of the Ṣaḥābah and the Ahl al-Sunnah. Such a person will then be a disbeliever according to the consensus of the Ummah.²

He goes on to mention several evidences from the Qur’ān and the Sunnah which extoll the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and thereafter deduces therefrom the disbelief of the Shī‘ah due to their belief regarding them.³

He also mentions that one of the reasons the Shī‘ah are excommunicated is because they claim that omissions and distortions have taken place in the Qur’ān and presents some of their views in that regard.⁴

Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb

Imām Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Wahhāb has issued the ruling of several doctrines of the Shī‘ah equating to disbelief. Hence after presenting the belief of the Twelvers

1 ‘Alī ibn Sulṭān ibn Muḥammad al-Harawī, well known as al-Qārī. A Ḥanafī scholar, one of the retainers of immense knowledge. He wrote many beneficial books amongst which is his commentary on Mishkāṭ al-Maṣābīḥ which is the biggest of them, *Sharḥ Al-Shifā’*, *al-Nukhbah* etc. He passed away in 1014 A.H. (*Khulāṣah al-Athar* 3/185-186; *al-Badr al-Ṭāli’* 1/445-446).

2 *Shamm al-‘Awāriḍ fi Dhamm al-Rawāfiḍ* (manuscript) p. 6.

3 Ibid. p. 252-254.

4 Ibid. p. 259.

regarding the denigration of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and cursing them, and presenting what Allah and his Rasūl صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ have said regarding them, he says:

فإذا عرفت أن آيات القرآن تكاثرت في فضلهم، والأحاديث المتواترة بمجموعها ناصة على كمالهم، فمن اعتقد فسقهم أو فسق مجموعهم وارتدادهم وارتدادهم أو اعتقد حقيقة سبهم وإباحته، أو سبهم مع اعتقاد حقيقة سبهم أو حليته فقد كفر بالله تعالى ورسوله... والجهل بالتواتر القاطع ليس بعذر، وتأويله وصرفه عن غير دليل معتبر غير مفيد، كمن أنكر فرضية الصلوات الخمس جهلا لفرضيتها، فإنه بهذا الجهل يصير كافرا، وكذا لو أولها على غير المعنى الذي نعرفه فقد كفر، لأن العلم الحاصل من نصوص القرآن والأحاديث الدالة على فضلهم قطعي.

ومن خص بعضهم بالسب فإن كان ممن تواتر النقل في فضله وكماله كالخلفاء فإن اعتقد حقيقة سبه أو إباحته فقد كفر لتكذيبه ما ثبت قطعا عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ومكذبه كافرا، وإن سبه من غير اعتقاد حقيقة سبه أو إباحته فقد فسق، لأن سباب المسلم فسوق، وقد حكم بعض فيمن سب الشيعين بالكفر مطلقا. وإن كان ممن لم يتواتر النقل في فضله وكماله، فالظاهر أن سابه فاسق إلا أن يسبه من حيث صحبته لرسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فإن ذلك كفر.

وغالب هؤلاء الرافضة الذين يسبون الصحابة يعتقدون حقيقة سبهم أو إباحته بل وجوبه، لأنهم يتقربون بذلك إلى الله تعالى ويرون ذلك من أجل أمور دينهم

Now you have learnt that the verses of the Qur'ān regarding their virtues are abundant, and the diffusely transmitted narrations are all emphatic regarding their perfection. Hence any person who believes that they were sinners/their entire group was sinful, that they apostatised/their entire group apostatised, that it is correct and permissible to denigrate them, or denigrates them considering it to be correct or permissible; has indeed disbelieved in Allah ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ. Being unaware of a categorically established phenomenon of Dīn is no excuse; likewise interpreting such a phenomenon with an interpretation which is not backed by evidence or diverting it from its established meaning is useless. For example, a person who rejects the obligation of the five daily Ṣalāhs due to not being aware of its obligatory status, because of his unawareness he will become a disbeliever; similarly if he interprets it with an interpretation other than the one we know he will become a disbeliever. The reason being that the knowledge which we draw from the verses of the Qur'ān and from the Sunnah which extoll their virtues is definitive.

Whoever denigrates a specific individual from among them, if his virtue and nobility is established through diffuse transmissions, like the Khulafā', and the denigrator considers it correct or permissible to denigrate him, then he becomes a disbeliever, due to him belying that which is categorically established from Nabī ﷺ; and any person who denies such an aspect is a disbeliever. However if he reviles him not considering it to be correct or permissible then he is a sinner; because reviling a believer is a sin. Some have, however, unconditionally considered a person who reviles Abū Bakr and 'Umar to be a disbeliever.

And if he is such that his virtue is not definitively established, then apparently the one who denigrates him is a sinner, unless he reviles him due to him being a Ṣaḥābī of Rasūl Allah ﷺ; for that is disbelief.

Most of these Rāfiḍah who revile the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم consider it correct or permissible, in fact even compulsory to do so, because they aspire to seek closeness to Allah سبحانه وتعالى by doing so and consider it to be the greatest aspect of their dogma^{1,2}

Thereafter he says:

وما صح عن العلماء من أنه لا يكفر أهل القبلة فمحمول على من لم بدعته مكفرة... ولا شك أن تكذيب رسول الله فيما ثبت عنه قطعاً كفر، والجهل في مثل ذلك ليس بعذر

And what is authentically established from the scholars regarding not excommunicating people of the Qiblah is based upon people whose innovations do not result in disbelief. It is without doubt that belying Rasūl Allah ﷺ in aspects which are categorically established from him

1 They have actually surpassed the limits of reviling and have steeped into excommunicating them. In fact they even say that whoever considers Abū Bakr and 'Umar رضي الله عنهم to be Muslims Allah will not look at him and will talk to him and for him will be a server punishment. (See: p. 982 onwards of this book.) . Their evils regarding the Ṣaḥābah have always increased and become more extreme with the passage of time until they have now settled upon extremism after which there is no extremism.

2 *Risālah fī al-Radd 'alā al-Rawāfiḍ* p. 18-19.

is disbelief. And ignorance in such aspect is no excuse.¹

After presenting what features in their books regarding the interpolation of the Qur’ān and omission occurring therein he says the following:

يلزم من هذا تكفير الصحابة حتى علي حيث رضوا بذلك... وتكذيب قوله تعالى: لَا يَأْتِيهِ الْبَاطِلُ مِنْ بَيْنِ يَدَيْهِ وَلَا مِنْ خَلْفِهِ تَنْزِيلٌ مِّنْ حَكِيمٍ حَمِيدٍ وقوله: إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ ومن اعتقد عدم صحة حفظه من الإسقاط واعتقد ما ليس منه أنه منه فقد كفر

This necessitates the excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah including ‘Alī (due to it implying) that they were ‘pleased’ with it... It also necessitates rejecting the verse: *‘Falsehood cannot approach it from before it or from behind. Indeed it is a revelation from a [Lord who is] Wise and Praiseworthy,’* and the verse: *‘it is we who sent down the message [i.e., the Qur’ān], and indeed, we will be its guardian.’* Hence, any person who believes that the Qur’ān was not preserved from omissions and believes what is not actually part of it to be part of it has indeed disbelieved.²

He likewise says the following regarding those who beseech others as intermediaries besides Allah, as is the case of the Shī‘ah with their Imāms:

ومن جعل بينه وبين الله وسائط يدعوهم يسألهم الشفاعة ويتوكل عليهم كفر إجماعاً

Whoever believes in intermediaries between him and Allah, whom he asks, seeks intercession from and relies upon, he has disbelieved according to the consensus of the Ummah.³

He has also said that whoever gives preference to the Imāms over the Ambiyā’ he has disbelieved according to the consensus of the Ummah, as is reported by several scholars.⁴

1 *Risālah fī al-Radd ‘alā al-Rāfiḍah* p. 14-15.

2 *Risālah fī al-Radd ‘alā al-Rawāfiḍ* p. 14-15.

3 *Risālah Nawāqid al-Islām* p. 283. (Incorporated in *al-Jāmi’ al-Farīd* which is published by Jumailū).

4 *Risālah fī al-Radd ‘alā al-Rawāfiḍ* p. 29. Also see p. 838 of this book.

Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Dehlawī¹

After doing a comprehensive study of the Twelver dogma from their reliable sources he concludes thus:

ومن استكشف عقائدهم الخبيثة وما انطوا عليه، علم أن ليس لهم في الإسلام نصيب وتحقق كفرهم لديه

A person who discovers their despicable beliefs and what they entail will realise that they have no share in Islam and their disbelief will become evident to him.²

Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Shawkānī³

He says:

إن أصل دعوة الروافض كيان الدين ومخالفة شريعة المسلمين. والعجب كل العجب من علماء الإسلام وسلاطين الدين كيف تركوهم على هذا المنكر البالغ في القبح إلى غايته ونهايته، فإن هؤلاء المخذولين لما أرادوا رد هذه الشريعة المطهرة ومخالفتها طعنوا في أعراض العقول الضعيفة بهذه الذريعة الملعونة، والوسيلة الشيطانية. فهم يظهرون السب واللعن لخير الخليفة ويضمرون العناد للشريعة ورفع أحكامها عن العباد. وليس في الكباثر أشنع من هذه الوسيلة بها إليه، فإنه أقبح منها، لأنه عناد لله عز وجل ولرسوله ولشريعته.

فكان حاصل ما هم فيه من ذلك أربع كباثر كل واحدة منها كفر بواح: الأولى: العناد لله عز وجل، والثانية: العناد لرسوله صلى الله عليه وسلم، والثالثة: العناد لشريعته المطهرة ومحاوله أبطالها، والرابعة: تكفير الصحابة رضي الله عنهم الموصوفين في كتاب الله بأنهم أشداء على الكفار، وإن الله تعالى يغيب بهم الكفار، وأنه قد رضي عنهم مع أنه قد ثبت في هذه الشريعة المطهرة أن كفر مسلماً كفر كما في الصحيحين

1 ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Aḥmad (Walī Allah) ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥīm al-‘Umarī al-Fārūqī, accorded the title the lantern of India. Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb says, “He was a leading scholar of India and had thorough knowledge of the books of the Shī‘ah.” He passed away in 1239 A.H. (*al-A‘lām* 4/138; *Muqaddamah Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnay ‘Ashariyyah* of Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb).

2 *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnay ‘Ashariyyah* p. 300.

3 Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allah al-Shawkānī, the great scholar of Yemen and the author of *Faṭḥ al-Qadīr* and *Nayl al-Awṭār*, amongst other beneficial works. He passed away in 1250 A.H. (*al-Badr al-Ṭālī* 2/214-225).

وغيرهما من حديث ابن عمر أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال: إذا قال الرجل لأخيه يا كافر فقد باء به أحدهما، فإن كان كما قال وإلا رجعت عليه.

وبهذا يتبين أن كل رافضي خبيث يصير كافرا بتكفيره لصحابي واحد، فكيف بمن كفر كل الصحابة، واستثنى أفرادا بسيرة تغطية لما هو فيه من الضلال على الطعام الذين لا يعقلون الصحيح.

The very basis of the Rāfiḍī propagation is a plot against the Dīn and an opposition of the Sharī'ah of the Muslims.

Astonishing indeed is the case of the scholars of Islam and the rulers of Dīn. How did they leave these people upon this vice which has reached its furthest extent in despicableness? When these losers intended to reject the pristine Sharī'ah and oppose it, they tarnished the reputations of the bearers thereof, without whom we have no other way of accessing it. They misled people with weak minds by way of this accursed ploy and satanic means. Hence they openly revile and curse the best of creation and inwardly they bear enmity for the Sharī'ah and desire to lift it away from the bondsmen.

In the major violations there is not any means more reprehensible than the means they have adopted, due to it being outright rebellion against Allah ﷻ, His Rasūl ﷺ, and the Sharī'ah. Hence the crux of what they are steeped in is four major violations, each of which is open disbelief:

1. Rebellion against Allah.
2. Rebellion against His Rasūl.
3. Rebellion against His pristine Sharī'ah and an attempt to discard it.
4. Excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ whom Allah ﷻ has described in the Qur'ān by saying that they are stern against the disbelievers, that He enrages the disbeliever by way of them and that He is pleased with them.

This is besides the fact that it is well established in this pristine Sharī'ah that whoever excommunicates a Muslim himself enters disbelief, as is

established in the narration of Ibn ‘Umar which appear in *Ṣaḥīḥayn* wherein Nabī ﷺ says: “When a person says to his brother, O disbeliever, one of them returns with it; if he is the way he said (then the pronouncer will be free), or else it will return to him (the pronouncer).”¹

From this it is evident that every Rāfiḍī is wicked and enters disbelief because of excommunicating even one Ṣaḥābī. What would the status of a person who excommunicates all the Ṣaḥābah and excludes only a few individuals in order to conceal his misguidance from the riffraff who do not fathom evidences, be?²

The scholars of the Ottoman Empire

Zayn al-‘Ābidīn ibn Yūsuf al-Askūnī has reported in his book which he wrote during the reign of the Ottoman Sultan Muḥammad Khan ibn Sultan Ibrāhīm Khan that the later scholars of the empire all unanimously issued Fatwās of their disbelief.³

The Scholars of *Mā Warā’ al-Nahr*⁴

Ālūsī the author of the *Tafsīr* mentions:

ذهب معظم علماء ما وراء النهر إلى كفر الإثني عشرية وحكموا بإباحة دمائهم وأموالهم وفروج نسائهم، حيث إنهم يسبون الصحابة رضي الله عنهم لا سيما الشيخين وهما السمع والبصر منه عليه الصلاة

1 The narration appears with similar wording in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī: Chapter of etiquette: sub-chapter regarding a person who excommunicates his brother without a valid reason being as he said: 7/ 96; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: Chapter of Īmān: sub-chapter regarding the Īmān of a person who says to his Muslim brother ‘oh Kāfir’: 1/79; *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*: chapter of Sunnah: sub-chapter regarding the increasing and decreasing of Īmān: 5/64; *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*: chapter of Īmān: sub-chapter regarding a person who accuses his brother of disbelief: 5/22; *Muwaṭṭa’ Mālik*: Chapter of speech: sub-chapter regarding disliked speech: p. 984; *Musnad Aḥmad* 2/18, 23, 44, 47; *Musnad al-Ṭayālīsī* p. 252.

2 Al-Shawkānī: *Nathr al-Jawhar ‘alā Ḥadīth Abī Dhar* (manuscript) p. 15-16.

3 Al-Askūnī: *al-Radd ‘alā al-Shī‘ah* (manuscript) p. 5.

4 *Mā Warā’ al-Nahr* refers to the areas after the Amu Darya which is in Khorasan. Whatever is to the east of the river was known as the lands of Hayāṭīlah and after Islam it was termed *Mā Warā’ al-Nahr*. And whatever is to the west of it is Khorasan and Khwarazm.

والسلام، وينكرون خلافة الصديق ويقذفون عائشة أم المؤمنين رضي الله عنها مما برأها الله تعالى منه، يفضلون بأسرهم عليا كرم الله وجهه على غير أولي العزم من المرسلين، ومنهم من يفضلوه عليه أيضا... ويجحدون سلامة القرآن العظيم من الزيادة والنقص

Majority of the *Mā Warā' al-Nahr* scholars have opined that the Twelvers are disbelievers. They have issued the ruling of their blood, wealth, and women being permissible. This is because they revile the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, especially Abū Bakr and 'Umar رضي الله عنهما who were like the ears and eyes of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم, they reject the Khilāfah of al-Ṣiddīq and accuse 'Ā'ishah رضي الله عنها of that from which Allah has exonerated her, they give preference to 'Alī رضي الله عنه over the prophets besides the *Ulū al-'Azm*, some amongst them give preference to him over them as well;¹ and they deny the preservation of the Qur'ān from additions and omissions.²

These are some of the Fatwās of the scholars of Islam and their leaders in this regard. I will suffice on this amount.

In the books of Fiqh there are many more views regarding their disbelief which one can very easily refer to, and thus there is no need for mentioning them here.³

1 Ambiyā' endowed with earnestness and patience, refers to: Muḥammad, Ibrāhīm, Mūsā, Nūḥ and 'Īsā عليهم السلام.

2 *Nahj al-Salāmah* (manuscript) p. 29-30.

3 See for example: *al-'Uqūd al-Durriyyah fī Tanqīḥ al-Fatāwā al-Ḥāmidīyyah* of Ibn 'Ābidīn wherein he cites the Fatwa of Shaykh Nūḥ al-Ḥanafī who has excommunicated them for many reasons. It is a long fatwa (*al-'Uqūd al-Durriyyah* p. 92). Therein he also cites what the exegete Abū al-Sa'ūd has said and has also reported the consensus of the scholars on their excommunication (ibid. p. 93).

Likewise the author of *al-Fatāwā al-Bazzāziyyah Muḥammad ibn Shihāb*, known as Ibn al-Bazzāz and passed away in 827 A.H., says, "It is necessary to excommunicate the Kaysāniyyah because of them allowing Badā' for Allah. And it is necessary to excommunicate the Rawāfiḍ due to them believing in the Raj'ah of the dead..." (*Al-Fatāwā al-Bazzāziyyah* which is printed in the footnotes of *al-Fatāwā al-Hindiyyah* 6/318).

And *al-Ashbāh wa al-Nazā'ir* Ibn Nujaym mentions, "Reviling Abū Bakr and 'Umar and cursing them is disbelief. (*Al-Ashbāh wa al-Nazā'ir* p. 190).

Also see: *Nawāqid al-Rawāfiḍ* (manuscript) of Makhdūm al-Shīrāzī who has compiled the views of the scholars of the various schools regarding the excommunication of the Shī'ah: p. 187, onwards; *Takfīr al-Shī'ah* (manuscript) of Muṭaḥhar ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Ismā'īl p. 51.

Important Points worth Consideration:

Firstly, these are the rulings of the scholars before the proliferation of the books of the Rawāfiḍ and their open disclosure of their beliefs which we see today. That is why the pages of this study include some beliefs of the Twelvers which the scholars of Islam previously attributed to the Bāṭiniyyah Qarāmiṭah, like the issue of the omissions and distortions in the Qur'ān which is well-recorded in their books; just as it includes a fair amount of their beliefs regarding the principles of Dīn. Over and above that, some of their beliefs which were not commonly known, like the belief of *Ṭīnah* and others, were also included in this discussion.

All of this implies that the ruling regarding them today should be more hard and stern.

Secondly, the later Rāfiḍah and the contemporaries among them have gathered the worst of ideas and the most reprehensible of them; they have adopted the idea of the Qadariyyah regarding the denial of *Qadr*, the ideas of the Jahmiyyah regarding the denial of the attributes of Allah and the Qur'ān being created, the viewpoint of the Sufis, in the view of some of their eminent scholars, regarding the deviance of *Waḥdah* (singularity of existence) and *Ittiḥād* (annihilation into the creator), the view of the Saba'iyyah regarding the deification of 'Alī, the view of the Khawārij regarding the excommunication of the Muslims, and the view of the Murji'ah in asserting that with the love of 'Alī no sin is harmful. Rather they have even treaded the path of the polytheists in venerating graves, going around them, performing Ṣalāh towards them with the Qiblah behind them, and all other actions which are purely from the religion of the polytheists.¹

After all of this, does there remain any doubt in this that this cult has chosen for itself a religion other than the religion of the Muslims? Although they have professed the *Shahādatān* but they have violated them with many a violations, as you can see.

1 For the details of all of this refer to the second chapter of this book and also see p. 1417 onwards.

However, it is important to consider, according to the approach of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding excommunication that these ideas which they hold, which are in complete contrast with the teachings of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, are surely disbelief; likewise their actions which are akin to the actions of the disbelievers are also disbelief. But excommunicating a specific individual from those who acknowledge the same Qiblah and issuing a ruling of him being doomed to Jahannam forever is dependent upon the conditions of excommunication being met and all impediments thereof being absent. That is to say that we will make general statements based on the proof-texts pertaining to promises, warnings, impugning, and excommunicating, but a ruling regarding a specific person falling part of those generalisations will be suspended until evidence demanding that is found and is not contradicted. That is why the scholars do not excommunicate a person who, due to newly accepting Islam or due to growing up in a very distant village, considers any of the forbidden acts to be permissible; because the ruling of disbelief can only be issued after the reaching of the message, and probably amongst these people there are those whom the texts which are contrary to what they believe have not reached and therefore does not know that Nabī ﷺ was sent with them. Hence it will be said that a particular view constitutes disbelief, but only those people will be excommunicated against who such evidence is established that the denier thereof is rendered a disbeliever and not anyone else.¹

1 *Al-Fatāwā* 28/500-501; also see for the details of this issue: *al-Fatāwā* 12/466, onwards; 23/345, onwards.

The Epilogue

All praise is due to Allah by Whose grace all good actions reach culmination. May His peace descend upon the one with whom He terminated prophethood, upon his household, and his Companions, who were loyal to Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allah ﷺ and the truth that he came with, were partisans thereof, and were by the grace of Allah brothers at all times.

I have spent more than four years deliberating over the issues of this study. I spent this time gathering academically credible content from the reliable sources of the Shī‘ah and other sources, organising it, presenting it, studying it, and analysing it. How difficult it is indeed to read regarding and listen to a people whom Allah has caused to be unfortunate, misguided, and blinded; a people who follow a non-existent Imām, believe in a non-existent book, a fictitious Ja‘far and many other fables; a people whose narrations attack the Book of Allah which He revealed, preserved, and upon which the Muslims unanimously concurred throughout the centuries, who believe the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ—which the Ummah compiled and spent all its efforts in preserving, who discard the unanimity of the pious predecessors and adhere to the ‘views’ of an unknown group entertaining the possibility that the Mahdī might have emerged in disguise from his hiding spot and voiced his opinion with them; a people that excommunicate the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ with whom Allah was pleased and who in return were pleased with Him, who strove in His path and propagated the word of Allah on the earth; all of this due to believing in lies and forgeries which some heretics attributed to the Ahl al-Bayt.

All praise is due to Allah ﷻ upon the boons of intellect, īmān, and conviction.

At the end of this study it is crucial to pause and sum up some of the results which have come through. We will thus present, whilst focussing on some aspects of its various angles, the following points:

1. The literal meaning of *Tashayyu'* is to support and follow. This meaning is neither found in the Shī'ah of today nor in most of the Shī'ah of the past. Hence they are the Rāfiḍah as the pious predecessors dubbed them, or, in other words, they are Shī'ah by name but are far from being the partisans and supporters of 'Alī عليه السلام.
2. The word *Tashayyu'* has appeared in the Qur'ān in most places with negative connotations. In the Sunnah there is no specific mention of this cult save in a few weak narrations wherein the word 'Rāfiḍah' appears, and that also with negative connotations.
3. Shī'ism has many phases, sects, and levels; some steeped in extremism and others more moderate. Hence the understanding of the term 'extremism in Shī'ism' was different for those of the early past in contrast to those who came thereafter. It has actually become evident that many of the beliefs of the contemporary Shī'ah were considered to be extreme according to their early scholars of the fourth century. What would then be the viewpoint of the initial Shī'ah regarding these beliefs?

The definition of Shī'ism is thus linked to the phases of its inception and the stages of its doctrinal development. Hence in the past a Shī'ī was a person who gave preference to 'Alī over 'Uthmān. But after the scholars of the Shī'ah accepted the books of al-Kulaynī, al-Qummī, al-Majlisī, and their like as their primary sources; extremism became rampant amidst the Shī'ah. Shī'ism eventually settled upon fanaticism and radicalism, to the extent that we see al-Khū'ī, the supreme Shī'ī authority of the current era, authenticating the narrations of Ibrāhīm al-Qummī which he brings in his *Tafsīr* despite them entailing disbelief.

For any person who is in doubt regarding the Shī'ah, in order to realise that the Shī'ah have chosen for themselves a religion other than the religion of Islam, it is sufficient to have a look at this book which is authenticated according to them.

4. Those who assumed a Shī'ī identity drew from the religions of Persia, Rome, Greece, and from the Jews and the Christians, amongst others. They infused whatever they had thumb sucked therefrom into Shī'ism. A true realisation indeed of a prophecy of Nabī ﷺ wherein he foretold that some of the members of this Ummah will follow the ways of those who preceded them.

The attempt to infuse some of these ideas into Muslim societies started at the hands of Ibn Saba' and his cohorts, but they did not gain acceptance in the cities of the Muslims except amidst a small group in Kufah. They did, however, managed to exploit some of the atrocities which befell the Ahl al-Bayt, like the murder of 'Alī and Ḥusayn, and promulgated these heresies in the Muslim world under the disguise of Shī'ism.

5. The Shī'ah splintered into many sub-sects throughout history, into three hundred, as suggested by some. But in these times they are all confined within three sects: the Ismā'īliyyah, the Zaydiyyah, and the Ithnay 'Ashariyyah which is the largest of them.

However, I have noticed an issue which I think should be studied and analysed in a dedicated study. And that is that there is barely a viewpoint which was propounded by a Shī'ī denomination in the various phases of history but that you will find evidence supporting it in the sources of the Twelvers. Hence you will find the heretical views of Ibn Saba', Mukhtār ibn Abī 'Ubayd, Bayān ibn Sam'ān, and Mughīrah ibn Sa'īd, amongst others, mentioned therein.

6. The Twelvers are also known as the Rāfiḍah, the Ja'fariyyah, and the Imāmiyyah. In the past they were also dubbed the Qaṭ'iyyah and the Mūsawiyyah. However, many scholars have suggested that the term Shī'ah if said today only applies to them.

Also, From the Twelvers many sub-sects emerged. Some being: the Shaykhiyyah, the Kashfiyyah, and the Bābiyyah.

7. The Shī'ah have, in attempting to substantiate their irregularities, gone in every direction. Hence at times they claim that the evidentiary texts which support their position were omitted by the Ṣaḥābah, at times they resort to esoteric interpretations for which Allah ﷻ has revealed no evidence, at times they claim that divine books descended upon their Imāms to support their dogma, and at times they cling onto narrations narrated through the transmissions of the Ahl al-Sunnah which are either forgeries or do not in any way establish what they claim. They have other deceitful ploys in this regard which even the Jews have no knowledge of even a tenth of. All of this is proof of the fact that they are incapable of establishing their dogma through sound Shar'ī principles.
8. Since the year 260 A.H. the Shī'ah are following a fictitious figure who does not exist. This renders them the Shī'ah of their scholars but not of the Ahl al-Bayt, or, put differently, they are the followers of the devils who assume the form of their 'absent Imām', as per the abundant reports which suggest their meeting with him.

Furthermore, all the Shī'ah have unanimously accepted the belief of this non-existent Imām due to it delivering them from the Ahl al-Bayt; because amongst the Ahl al-Bayt there were pious scholars, men of integrity, who exposed these heretics who ate the wealth of people in the name of the Ahl al-Bayt, and who innovated such innovations for which Allah has revealed no evidence and ascribed them to the Ahl al-Bayt. Thus by acknowledging this fictitious figure, all authority, wealth, and honour became the exclusive share of the scholars.

9. The Shī'ah assert that the Qur'ān cannot be evidence but with a guardian who has to be one of the Twelve Imāms. They say, "The Imām is the speaking Qur'ān and the Book of Allah is the silent Qur'ān." They claim that all the knowledge of the Qur'ān is with this guardian and there is no one who shares that knowledge with him. Hence he is the explanation of the Qur'ān, rather the Qur'ān itself. Therefore, he has the prerogative of specifying the generalisations of the Qur'ān, restricting the unqualified,

clarifying the unclear, and abrogating whatever he wants. Beyond that, they have actually accorded the Imām cart blanche authority in all of Dīn.

They also claim that every verse has an esoteric meaning. They say, “Every verse has seven inner meanings.” Then their allocations of meanings to the verses drastically increase. They thus say, “Every verse has seventy inner meanings.”

Likewise, regarding the Book of Allah ﷻ which He revealed to guide this Ummah to the straight path in all spheres of life, they claim that it was revealed regarding the Twelve Imāms and their enemies, who are the Ṣaḥābah according to them.

That is why we find that they have interpreted all the verses of Tawḥīd, Islam, the principles of īmān, permissible acts, and impermissible acts with the Twelve Imāms. Conversely, they have interpreted all the verses of Shirk, kufr, obscene acts, vice, and oppression with the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ and whoever followed them from the believers.

It is evident that the origins of all these interpretations are from Mughīrah ibn Sa‘īd and Jābir al-Ju‘fī. Subsequent to them, the extremist Rawāfiḍ followed them and gradually made additions, exaggerated and consequently reached an extent unfathomable even to their predecessors. The scholars of these times consider these collections which contain this nonsense to be from their most reliable sources.

10. The fallacy of the interpolation of the Qur’ān was first propounded by the Shī‘ah of the second century. The first proponents thereof are said to be Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam and Shayṭān al-Tāq. One of the reasons which compelled them to espouse it was that they could not find any evidence wherewith they could convince their followers of their claims, due to the Book of Allah being empty of any explicit mention of their Imāms and their beliefs.

But with the start of the fourth century the entire Ummah unanimously impugned them and excommunicated them due to making such horrendous assertions. Hence their supreme scholar Ibn Bābawayh announced the disassociation of the Shī'ah from this belief and deemed any person who attributes it to them to be a liar. He was followed by Ibn al-Murtaḍā, al-Ṭūsī, and al-Ṭabarsī.

It was probably owing to this denial that some scholars attributed this belief to the Bāṭiniyyah, whereas the Bāṭiniyyah did not get involved in this issue; the people who were responsible for it and forged many a reports regarding it were the Twelvers.

This belief was recorded in the first book of the Shī'ah, the book of Sulaym ibn Qays, which according to many of their scholars is a fabrication and the author thereof is unknown.

11. Regarding the pristine Sunnah they hold some very reprehensible principles; like the belief that the Imāms received revelation, that the greatest of Allah's creation Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام would come to them and that a person who heard something from the Imām can relate it by saying that 'Allah said', because their speech is like the speech of Allah and obedience to them is like obedience to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.

They also aver that the Holy Spirit is amongst them (the Imāms) and through his medium they learn of what is beneath the throne to what is beneath the soil; they see through his medium what is hidden from them in the various parts of the land and what is in the heavens. The Imāms also go to the throne of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى every Friday to take whatever knowledge they desire.

They likewise say that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى directly converses with 'Alī and the Imāms.

All of this according to them is spontaneous knowledge. As for the documented knowledge which they inherited from Rasūl Allah ﷺ, it is contained in imaginary books, like the *Jāmi'ah*, the *Jafr*, the book of 'Alī, the *Abīṭah*, the *Dīwān of the Shī'ah*, etc.

They go on to say that 'Alī continually assimilated this knowledge and these books during the lifetime of Nabī ﷺ and even after his demise, to the exclusion of the rest of the Ṣaḥābah. Thus he alone is the gateway to the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, and whoever claims to have heard from anyone other than him has committed *Shirk*.

Furthermore, revelation to the Imāms did not cease to continue till the year 260 A.H. Another 74 years thereafter it continued via the medium of the representatives of the Mahdī; and thereafter through the medium of their scholars who had secret relationships with the Mahdī. Owing to this, their scholars would always invent new innovations for them, so much so that 'Alī al-Karakī, the supreme scholar of the Safawid dynasty contrived for them the permissibility of prostrating to the creation and the ruling of prostrating upon soil. Khomeini likewise accorded himself and his state all the tasks and authorities of the Mahdī.

Furthermore, they have books exclusive to them which contain all these fallacies. These are four books: *al-Kāfī*, *al-Tahdhīb*, *al-Istibṣār*, and *Man lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faqīh*. Their later scholars added four more books: *al-Wāfī*, *al-Biḥār*, *al-Wasā'il*, *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il*. Over and above these books they have deemed a number of other works of their scholars to be just like the four early works in terms of evidence.

Furthermore, at first they would accept everything which appeared in their narrations until Ibn Taymiyyah came about, refuted the claims of Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, and derided their ignorance regarding ḥadīth. This prompted them to categorise their narrations in to *Ṣaḥīḥ*, *Ḥasan*, *Muwaththaq*, and *Ḍa'īf*. The catalyst for doing so was avoiding the criticism

of people, as is clear from the animated dispute which broke out between the Shī'ah due to their differences on the issue which divided them into Uṣūlīs and Akhbārīs. This is a very important conclusion which was reached in this study.

One of their scholars has actually admitted that if they apply the Sunnī principles of authenticating and impugning, nothing of their legacy will remain, and thus the Shī'ah would have to find themselves another dogma.

Moving on, amongst the transmitters of their narrations there are fictitious figures who do not exist, and most of them are affiliates of heterodoxies even according to the Twelvers themselves. Hence they are disbelievers, but they still accept their narrations due to them being Shī'ah. As for the Ahl al-Sunnah the Zaydiyyah and members of the Ahl al-Bayt beside the Twelve Imāms, they reject their narrations; they have even gone to the extent of rejecting the narrations of Zayd ibn 'Alī. The narrations of an Imāmī who is upon their creed on the other hand, be he whoever he is, is accepted. Hence their scholars say, "A blemish in the Dīn of a person does not affect the authenticity of his narration."

Lastly, the Rāfiḍah have based all their beliefs and principles upon the forged narrations of these liars which they attributed to the Imāms. The Imāms were free from them; because amongst them was 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib to whom obedience was compulsory, like the Khulafā' before him; amongst them were eminent leaders of knowledge and Dīn, like 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, Abū Ja'far al-Bāqir, and Ja'far al-Ṣādiq who deserved the same veneration the other scholars and religious people deserve; amongst them were those who were below that; amongst them were some who were impugned by the scholars, like al-Ḥasan al-'Askarī; and amongst them is the one who does not exist, i.e. the fictitious Mahdī who is absent since the year 260 A.H. Hence whatever they attribute to them is from the forgeries of the heretics of the bygone eras.

12. They do not believe in the consensus of the Ummah. Therefore, if an opinion is attributed to their non-existent Imām via one of his representatives and the entire Ummah opposes it, evidence will be in his opinion and not in the stance of the Ummah. Actually, opposing the Ummah is one of their established principles. They say, "Whatever opposes the Ummah bears guidance." What is even more surprising is that if the Shī'ah themselves concur upon something and an unknown group avers something else, evidence will be in the position of the unknown group due to the possibility that the Mahdī might have emerged in disguise and voiced an opinion in harmony with theirs. The implication of this is that their dogma will continue to expand throughout time; because the evil Men and Jinn will continue to forge for them whatever they want as long as this cult holds onto this principle.
13. In their beliefs regarding the principles of Dīn it has become clear that they are Jahmiyyah in denying the attributes of Allah, Qadariyyah in denying Qadr, Murji'ah in believing that no sin is harmful after acknowledging the Imām, and Khawārij, in comparison to others, in excommunicating everyone besides themselves.

In their beliefs regarding the divine books and messengers some of their beliefs were the following: divine books descended upon the Imāms; they possessed the books of the previous prophets which they read and according to which they judged; the Imāms' miracles were like the prophets; the Imāms are superior to the prophets and it is by virtue of them that evidence will be established upon the bondsmen.

In their beliefs regarding the afterlife they aver that it will be for the Imām, that Jannah was the dowry of Fāṭimah, that the Imāms enjoy the bounties of Jannah in this world and that the reckoning of the creation will be the prerogative of the Imām on the Day of Judgment. They believe that there is another Jannah and another Jahannam other than the Jannah and Jahannam the Muslims believe in, that Qum has a door to Jannah, and that the people of Qum will not be raised like the rest.

14. As for their exclusive beliefs which are unique to them, they are the following: the Imāmah of the Twelve Imāms, their infallibility, Taqiyyah, belief in the absent Mahdī, Ghaybah, Raj'ah, Ṣuhūr, Ṭinah and Badā'.

Hence the leadership of the Ummah is the exclusive right of the Twelve Imāms. Therefore, anyone who presides over the affairs of the Muslims besides them is a *Ṭāghūt* (devil/idol) whom Allah will not look at, will not talk to on the Day of Judgment and will punish with a painful punishment. Similar will be the end result of any person who accepts him as his ruler and pledges allegiance to him.

Furthermore, these Twelve Imāms do not err, forget, and make mistakes, since the time of their birth till as long as they live.

When the statements of the Imāms and their actions contradicted the belief of infallibility they invented the doctrines of Badā' and Taqiyyah in order to conceal their false ideas. Hence the actions of the Imāms which are harmonious with the Muslims are to be interpreted as Taqiyyah and their foretellings which are against the reality are to be interpreted as *Badā'*.

In addition, the Shī'ah were faced with a conundrum when the line of Imāmah abruptly ended with the death of al-Ḥasan al-'Askarī without issue, due to them conceiving of the Imāms as specific individuals (who are divinely appointed).

Hence after a lengthy confusion, they contrived a son for him who went into occultation when he was still a child. This alleged figure is the Imām of the Muslims till today who will one day re-emerge.

Furthermore, Raj'ah entails that they and their enemies, the Ṣaḥābah, and whoever diligently followed them, will return to this world after death. Subsequently the Shī'ah will be afforded the opportunity to take revenge from them.

The belief of *Ẓuhūr* entails that the Imāms can emerge from their graves for specific people before the Day of Judgement and before the alleged *Rajʿah*. This is a novel belief which was documented by al-Majlisī in a dedicated chapter in *Biḥār*.

As for the belief of *Ṭīnah*, it is a secret belief which they hold. It suggests that the good of the Ahl al-Sunnah is for the Shīʿah and the bad of the Shīʿah is for the Ahl al-Sunnah. They use this to explain all the oppression, vice and evil which their societies were always replete with since the bygone eras.

15. The contemporary Shīʿah acknowledge the same sources as the ancient Shīʿah for the derivation of doctrine and law. In fact they have even integrated all the fabrications which the Safawid scholars fabricated and included the books which they authored, which are replete with disbelief and heresies, into their dogma. To add to the dilemma, all the publishing houses made it easy for them to spread all this evil. All of this made the Shīʿah even more fanatical.

But they deceive the Ahl al-Sunnah. Hence some of their scholars claim that they do not revile the *Ṣaḥābah* and do not believe in *Rajʿah*, for example. In the previous pages the reality of these claims was exposed.

They also claim that practicing *Taqiyyah* has come to an end. Whereas their source texts order them to practice it till the emergence of the *Mahdī*. In addition, their actions and statements suggest that they still practice it. Hence this statement is basically doing *Taqiyyah* over *Taqiyyah*.

There probably does not exist another cult on the surface of this earth which has deemed lying to be a commendable religious practice; because it constitutes nine tenths of their *Dīn*.

16. As for their influence in the Muslim world, it has become clear that they have left very grave ill-effects in the Ummah in the ideological sphere.

They brought about polytheism in the Ummah of Muḥammad ﷺ, prevented people from the Dīn of Allah, engendered the emergence of many heretical sub-sects, and attempted to misguide the Muslims from the Sunnah of their Nabī ﷺ. The negative influence they have had in the spheres of literature of history and upon some thinkers who are affiliates of the Ahl al-Sunnah are quite evident. Apart from this, they have other covert and overt means which they deploy to misguide the Ummah.

Likewise, they have left their influence in the social sphere by instigating internal strife within the Muslims, opposing and clandestinely plotting against Islamic leaderships and the Muslims whenever the opportunity arose. They also espoused obscenities and libertinism under the pretext of *Mut'ah Dawriyyah* and its like.

Similarly, in the economic sphere their influence is quite clear from their usurpation of the wealth of the Muslims by force and deceit, and their attempts to debilitate the economy of the Muslims in whichever way possible. In addition, the wealth which they receive from the people in the name of the Ahl al-Bayt was and still remains one of the main reasons for the desire of their scholars to remain upon their anomalies and opposition of the Muslims.

17. It has been established that they are disbelievers, and that they have no share in Islam whatsoever due to their polytheism, their excommunication of the Ṣaḥābah, and their accusations against the Qur'ān, amongst others.

There is nothing more astonishing and appalling than the fact that this cult, which comprises of millions of people, still remains upon all its fallacies and fables. Probably the only explanation thereof is that the scholars of the Shī'ah chose not to disclose the reality to their followers, doing so by deploying various deceptive means. Amongst these means the most glaring are the following: the

claim that their dogma is backed by what is transmitted through the sources of the Ahl al-Sunnah, the claim that their dogma is based upon the love of the Ahl al-Bayt and their partisanship, the plays which they do to retell the massacre of Karbalā’—which are known as al-Shabīh, and the establishment of gatherings of condolences which are filled with expressions of grief, mourning, and whatever else accompanies them, i.e. broadcasting, beating of drums, and relating the stories and tales of the alleged oppression. All of this leads to the inactiveness of the intellect and blind following, especially amidst the non-Arabs and the laity.

In conclusion, surely the greatest means to combat the problem of Shī’ism is promulgating the Sunnah amongst the Muslims in every place by deploying various means, and exposing the reality of the Shī’ah and how they oppose the principles of Islam without understating, overstating, and sensationalising.

وصلى الله وسلم على نبيينا محمد وآله وصحبه أجمعين. والحمد لله رب العالمين